

Also, petition of Chevrolet Tarrytown Leahy, urging repeal of tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Metal & Thermit Corporation, New York, opposing the continuance of the Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of MacArthur Bros. Co.; McKesson & Robbins; the international committee of the Young Men's Christian Association; and Emma J. Carr, principal Lockwood Academy, all of New York, favoring daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of Jacob Roth and others, to introduce a bill to save Jews in Poland and eastern countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of C. E. Pendell and others, to repeal daylight saving; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SEARS: Petition of New England Association and citizens of St. Cloud, Fla., asking that national soldiers' home be located at St. Cloud, Fla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition by citizens of the seventeenth congressional district of Illinois, in behalf of the rights of the Jugo-Slavs under the peace treaty with Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, protest against modification of war-time prohibition act from citizens of the seventeenth congressional district of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE: Protest of the Easton Board of Trade and individual residents of Easton, Bethlehem, and Northampton County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Croatian Gymnastic Society, of South Bethlehem, with reference to disposition of provinces under consideration by the peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: Resolution of mass meeting of 10,000 citizens of Providence, R. I., protesting against the Jewish massacres in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Petition of D. B. MaGee, pastor University Church, of Salina, Kans., protesting against repeal of the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of George F. Walston, against repeal of the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of members and friends of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hotchkiss, Colo., protesting against amendment of prohibition law pertaining to beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of members and friends of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Hotchkiss, Colo., against repeal of the war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTERS: Petition of St. Joseph's Sodality, of Johnstown, Pa., against the Smith educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Ladies Sodality of the Church of the Immaculate Conception, B. V. M., of Johnstown, Pa., against the Smith educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of St. Columba's Sodality, of Johnstown, Pa., against the Smith educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of St. Patrick's Ladies' Sodality of Johnstown, Pa., against the Smith educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of St. John's Ladies' Sodality of Johnstown, Pa., against the Smith educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of American Car & Foundry Co. of Huntington, W. Va., favoring the present daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Huntington Lodge, No. 104, International Association of Machinists, of Huntington, W. Va., favoring the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, June 5, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we invoke Thy blessing upon our labor this new day. The words which are spoken here are far-reaching in their effect. The final conclusions of this high office have to do with the happiness and prosperity of millions of Thy people. Give us a just sense of our responsibility. Give us a blessed consciousness of the Divine Presence, that we may know that we are working together with God in the upbuilding of a fairer, higher, and sweeter civilization. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, June 3, 1919, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Lodge	Sheppard
Ball	Hale	McCormick	Sherman
Borah	Harding	McCumber	Simmons
Brandeggee	Harris	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Harrison	McLean	Smith, Md.
Capper	Henderson	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Moses	Smoot
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Spencer
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Sterling
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Sutherland
Dillingham	Kellogg	Norris	Swanson
Edge	Kendrick	Nugent	Trammell
Elkins	Kenyon	Overman	Underwood
Fall	Keyes	Page	Wadsworth
Ferdald	King	Penrose	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Kirby	Phelan	Warren
France	Knox	Phipps	Watson
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Pomerene	Williams
Gay	Lenroot	Ransdell	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

GILLESPIE PLANT EXPLOSION (S. DOC. NO. 30).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$327.77 required by the War Department for payment of claims for personal injury or death sustained through the explosions and fires at the T. A. Gillespie Loading Co.'s plant in October, 1918, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

LONGEVITY PAY OF TEACHERS (S. DOC. NO. 29).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$73,000 required for longevity pay to school-teachers and allowances to principals, as provided for by law, for the fiscal year 1919, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EMPLOYEES OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 28).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a recommendation of the Auditor for the Post Office Department for the reappropriation of the unexpended balances of the appropriations for compensation to employees of that office for the fiscal year 1919, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE. I present two telegrams in the nature of petitions from citizens of Holyoke, Mass., which I ask to have printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hon. H. LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Resolution adopted at mass meeting May 29, 1919, by citizens of Polish extraction in Easthampton:

"Whereas on the 22d day of May, 1919, there were held in nearly all cities of the United States meetings and demonstrations at which one portion of the population was being incited in a demagogic manner against the other; and

"Whereas at these meetings there was made an attempt at disgracing in the eyes of the American people the new Polish State now arising from bondage of over a century; and

"Whereas, due to an ingenious propaganda, the Senate of the United States, contrary to the tenets of the Monroe doctrine and to the prin-

HOLYOKE, MASS., June 2, 1919.

ciple of the inviolability of the internal affairs of each and every country, interfered, without previously investigating the merits of the case, with the internal affairs of Poland, we therefore, American citizens of Polish descent, resolve as follows:

"First. To call upon the Secretary of State of the United States to curb forthwith said propaganda as carried on by the Jews, propaganda which is spreading unrest and racial hatred.

"Second. To impress upon the American press the necessity for a proper caution in connection with spreading news concerning Poland as supplied by the Jews, in order to avoid the jeopardizing of the good name of the American journalism, which good name might suffer a blot as soon as authentic information in re alleged massacres of the Jews in Poland would be on hand.

"Third. We call upon the Jewish population in America to be diligently cautious of the motives prompting the slandering of the Polish nation and behold the pernicious results of the anti-Polish propaganda, which can not but bring harm to the Jews in Poland, and which would solely benefit the Germans.

"We furthermore resolve to forward copies of these unanimously adopted resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, and to the Speakers of both Houses of the United States Congress."

C. LEWANDOWSKY, *Chairman.*

HOLYOKE, MASS., May 31, 1919.

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The following resolutions were adopted at a mass meeting of American citizens of Polish extraction, May 30, at Kosciuszko Hall, Holyoke, Mass.:

"Whereas almost on the very day when, at the peace conference in Paris, there were going on negotiations concerning the eastern frontiers of Poland, malicious intrigue attempted to disgrace Poland in the eyes of the world at large and of America in particular, by denouncing Poland as a country of pogroms and of anarchy was started; and

"Whereas for the purpose of achieving the aforesaid end Jewish propagandists did not hesitate to provoke racial hatred in America at a time when each and every loyal citizen of this country should be duty bound to preserve harmony among American citizens of whatever creed or race; and

"Whereas these very propagandists attempt to drag the United States Government and Congress into their shady political game by insinuating interference with the international affairs of Poland, an undertaking which might establish for Europe a precedent for a similar meddling with the internal affairs of the United States: We, therefore, American citizens of Polish descent, protesting solemnly against the unparalleled carelessness of disgracing the good name and the honor of the Polish nation without previously investigating the merits of the matter, without securing information from official Polish sources, do herewith

"Resolve, To call upon the United States Government to curb the investigating of one portion of the American Nation against the other in time to prevent the harm from passing beyond repair.

"To urge upon our fellow citizens to be more impartial, equitable, and just in giving credence to rumors concerning Poland; rumors emanating invariably from the same source and invariably benefitting solely the Germans.

"To call upon the American press, urging the latter to familiarize itself with matters Polish through the medium of trustworthy correspondents who have no racial interest in slandering Poland.

"Furthermore, we resolve to forward copies of this resolution, which was carried unanimously, to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Speakers of both Houses of Congress, and to the Associated Press."

KOSCIUSKO CLUB.

Mr. McCUMBER presented a memorial of the Congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Mott, N. Dak., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Thompson, N. Dak., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KELLOGG presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, St. Paul, Pleasant Grove, Rock Dell, Rochester, Salem, High Forest, Orion, Haverhill, Oronoco, Farmington, Viola, Eyota, Elmira, Cascade, Stewartville, Marion, Janesville, St. Clair, Smith Mills, Waldorf, Waseca, Eagle Lake, New Richland, Otisco, Matawan, Wells, Alma City, Pemberton, Morristown, Medford, Dover, Kalmar, and Waconia, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of St. Paul, Duluth, White Bear, Glenwood, Paynesville, Minneapolis, Fergus Falls, Rush City, Buffalo, and Hutchinson, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted at the twenty-fourth annual convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Washington, Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the franchise in the parishes and separate congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of the congregations of the First Baptist Church of Topeka, the Union Church of Castleton, the Presbyterian Church of Trousdale, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Tonganoxie, the First Methodist Church of Winfield, and the Methodist and Congregational Churches of Centralia; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Wellington, and of sundry citizens of Scott City, Colony, and Highland, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the repeal of war-

time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NEWBERRY presented memorials of the Chamber of Commerce of Kalamazoo, of sundry citizens of Holland, and of sundry rural letter carriers of the counties of Ottawa, Muskegon, Kent, and Newaygo, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented memorials of sundry citizens of Portland, Romeo, Big Rapids, Mount Clemens, Ionia, Lyons, Detroit, and Cadillac, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of Charles A. Learned Post, No. 1, United States World War Veterans, of Detroit, Mich., praying that conscientious objectors be prohibited from wearing the victory buttons, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jackson, Mich., praying for the repeal of the so-called "luxury" tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of Local Branch, No. 2, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for a readjustment of salaries of postal clerks, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SHERMAN. I send to the desk and ask to have read a telegram from Chicago, Ill., signed by certain injured private soldiers who have been discharged and are in hospitals at Chicago.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., June 3, 1919.

HON. L. Y. SHERMAN,

Washington, D. C.:

Army Hospital No. 32 ordered closed June 15. Patients transferred to Fort Sheridan. We in wheel chairs and on crutches protest leaving fireproof building and moved where our lives will be endangered in wooden buildings already condemned and publicly protested. We were willing to give our lives in France, but refuse to risk being burned alive here. Are helpless unless you interest Illinois Senators and Congressmen to keep us where we will be safe from death by fire and where we can have some comfort and recreation. Some of us are paralyzed. Many are unable to move without help. For God's sake come to our rescue.

Privates Walter F. Darnsfel, Edward Sauer, Ernest A. Cohn, George Prokosch, Harrison H. Webb, Johnston Rowiston, Joseph Krzywacki, M. B. Kipp, Gus Meyn, Charles H. Vanleet, George F. Hadd, Maurice T. Blair, Frank C. Schultz, Charles Chandler, Harry Rackowky, Irvine S. Tucker, Vito Adamo, Thomas H. Tiller, and 100 more of our pals if you want them.

Mr. SHERMAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of the counties of Hancock and McDonough, in the State of Illinois, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Monmouth, Little York, and Kirkwood, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALE presented a memorial of the Aroostook and Penobscot Union Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Presque Isle, Me., remonstrating against the free entry of potatoes from all other countries, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Yarmouth, Me., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Mapleton, Me., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FERNALD presented the memorials of E. C. McLaughlin, E. B. Tetley, G. H. Gove, and sundry other citizens of Maine, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PHELAN presented a memorial of the California Cattle-men's Association, of San Francisco, Calif., remonstrating against Government ownership or operation of marketing facilities, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. KNOX presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Pennsylvania, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas in the proper economic development of the resources of the various States of the Union, it is essential that a connected system of main arteries of traffic between the States be evolved, which will assist in the marketing and distribution of their products and commodities; and

Whereas in order to develop such an interstate system the Federal Government should establish a national highway system and make the necessary appropriations to carry the same into effect; and Whereas in the construction of a system of main arteries an opportunity will be offered to provide employment, during the period of adjustment of this Nation, for unemployed labor and the heroes returning from France: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the house concur), That the members of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby petition the Congress of the United States to establish a national system of highways, and to cooperate with the States of the Union in carrying out plans for the development of such a system, together with the provisions of the present Federal aid act or any amendment or amendments thereto.

Resolved, That the present appropriation for Federal aid to the States be continued and increased, and the States urged to undertake comprehensive highway improvements to keep pace with the transportation needs of the Nation.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth forward a copy of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and that a copy thereof be sent to each Member of said bodies from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

W. P. GALLAGHER,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

The foregoing resolution was concurred in by the house of representatives May 6, 1919.

THOMAS H. GARVIN,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Harrisburg, May 17, 1919.

PENNSYLVANIA, 807.

I, Cyrus E. Woods, secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, having the custody of the great seal of the Commonwealth, do hereby certify that the foregoing and annexed is a full, true, and correct copy of concurrent resolution No. 14-B, passed by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, petitioning the Congress of the United States to establish a national system of highways, etc., as the same remains on file and appears of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed, the day and year above written.
[SEAL]

CYRUS E. WOODS,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. KNOX presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Unionville, Newmansville, Towanda, and Powell, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Meadville, Cochran, Pen Argyl, Williamsport, Monessen, Wilkes-Barre, Hatboro, Lock Haven, Pittsburgh, Horsham, Houston, Shenandoah, West Chester, South Brownsville, Gowen City, and Ulysses, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 1358, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pleasant Hill, Pa., and a petition of Local Grange No. 1686, Patrons of Husbandry, of Gratz, Pa., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Eureka, Mont., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SOLDIERS' VIEW OF ANARCHISTIC OUTRAGES.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of the Come Back of June 4, 1919. The Come Back is published by and for the patients and enlisted personnel of the Walter Reed Army General Hospital, with the authority of the Surgeon General of the Army. It has, under the title "More plain words," a rather brief statement in every way showing the spirit we would expect in the gallant boys of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. I ask that the Secretary may read the article headed "More plain words."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What is the newspaper?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Come Back, published at the Walter Reed Hospital.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

MORE PLAIN WORDS.

Under the caption "Plain words," a circular, setting out the creed of the anarchist bomber, was found among the tattered clothes of the terrorist who was blown to pieces when he dynamited the home of A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General, late Monday night.

We take those "plain words" of social sedition, proclaiming "Down with the powers that be," to represent the tenets of all the band of "reds" who tried to murder several officials by setting infernal machines and wrecking the homes of their intended victims.

It is time for "plain words" when bombs are scattered and when "The Anarchist Fighters" put out literature announcing "It is war,

class war, against the darkness of your laws and the institutions you call order."

Army men are used to plain words. Open speaking and to the point is right in our line. We are just back from a campaign where "Over we go!" meant worlds of trouble for the Prussian lads who had said that our "so-called order" of democracy was all bunk.

We left several of our best "buddies" on the torn fields of France because we think our "so-called order" is one of the finest institutions on earth.

We have come back home with a deeper pride in the freedom of our laws because we have seen strong men die for their perpetuation and because we have looked upon the wreckage of other "so-called orders."

We have come back home, some of us with empty sleeves and shattered nerves, to enjoy the peace of freedom, for which we have suffered through two red years. We are a peace-loving lot, but we instinctively reach for the musket when we hear slander of the good things for which that old flag stands.

If there must be a house cleaning at home we are the boys to do it. If the autocracy of terrorism prowls in the shadows we are the fellows who are ready to go scouting for the scowling face.

We don't propose to allow Columbia to become a "no clean man's land"; we've had enough of the "so-called order" of might in Flanders.

Mystic promises of terror don't worry us. Prussian propaganda made black threats in more trying days; it bluffed lots of folks but not our outfit. We have seen the German menace smashed like an eggshell. We saw the infernal machines of the greatest war engine in history broken to atoms and the boasted Head Hussars hurled from their holds of hate.

We know how to subdue spies and snipers and submarines. We can squelch the sneaking terrorists.

We don't want any misunderstanding. Our order of democracy and justice is here to stay. The officers we placed at the head of our Government are going to stick on the job. "Old Glory" is going to float over a land of folks who do not hide bombs under front porches.

That is all of our plain words. In the drive on the terrorists you can count on those of us in the uniform of the United States for the front-line positions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 122) authorizing a commission to acquire and maintain a cemetery in France in the name of the United States for the reception and interment of the bodies of American officers and men who lost their lives in connection with the European war, and to appropriate \$500,000 therefor, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 7) thereon.

Mr. JONES of Washington, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 1274) making it unnecessary to secure permits from the United States Shipping Board for the construction of ships in American shipyards for foreign account, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 8) thereon.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 643) to provide for the equitable distribution of captured war devices and trophies to the States and Territories of the United States and to the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 9) thereon.

RATIFICATION OF TREATIES (S. DOC. NO. 26).

Mr. MOSES, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 67), and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the manuscript submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] on June 2, 1919, entitled "Ratification of treaties—method and procedure in foreign countries and proceedings in the Senate in the case of rejected treaties," be printed as a Senate document.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 27).

Mr. MOSES, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 68), and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

Resolved, That the articles submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK] on June 2, 1919, entitled "The league of nations," be printed as a Senate document.

REPRESENTATIVES OF IRELAND AT PARIS.

Mr. BORAH. I report from the Committee on Foreign Relations in an amended form Senate resolution 48 submitted by me, and I submit a report (No. 6) thereon. As it has been changed so that it would be difficult for the Secretary to read, I will read it.

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States earnestly requests the American peace commission at Versailles to endeavor to secure for Edward De Valera, Arthur Griffiths, and Count George Noble Plunkett a hearing before said peace conference in order that they may present the cause of Ireland.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho whether he thinks it will require any length of time for consideration?

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator mean of the peace conference?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; whether it will require any considerable length of time of the Senate? I have a resolution

coming over from yesterday, and I do not want it to be crowded out.

Mr. BORAH. I do not think it will take any considerable length of time. I do not know of any debate to be had upon it. I do not intend to discuss it at length myself, unless debate is started by some other Senator.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Otherwise, I should like to have the resolution go over until to-morrow.

Mr. BORAH. I do not think it will take any length of time to consider the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I dislike very much to object to the immediate consideration of this resolution, but I consider it ill-advised, and really none of our business. I shall object to the immediate consideration of the resolution. I shall, however, satisfy myself when it comes up in the regular way with merely voting against it and shall not take up the time of the Senate to discuss it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution goes to the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 1377) for the relief of Amherst W. Barber; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 1378) to authorize the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey to construct a bridge across the navigable waters of Newark Bay, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 1379) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marengo, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1380) granting a pension to Mary E. Hagedorn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 1381) granting pensions to certain soldiers and widows of deceased soldiers of the Utah Territorial Militia who served in the Indian wars in Utah Territory, and to amend the act approved March 4, 1917, entitled "An act to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars from January 1, 1859, to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes"; and

A bill (S. 1382) granting an increase of pension to Melvin G. Harmer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A bill (S. 1383) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended June 18, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 1384) for the relief of George W. Samson (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A bill (S. 1385) to donate war trophies to the city of St. Paul, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 1386) granting a pension to Sarah J. Strout (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1387) granting a pension to Walter White (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX:

A bill (S. 1388) to correct the military record of John L. O'Mara and grant him an honorable discharge; and

A bill (S. 1389) for the relief of Jacob Swartz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 1390) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to each of the several county seats in the State of Utah captured German cannon, cannon balls or shell, and gun carriages, condemned United States cannon, cannon balls, and shells, or gun carriages; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 1391) to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Park, Calif., and to change the name of said park to Roosevelt National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1392) for the relief of Capt. S. M. Neisser, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1393) granting a pension to James W. Wilson;

A bill (S. 1394) granting an increase of pension to Henry Dority (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1395) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Gunther (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DIAL:

A bill (S. 1396) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newberry, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1397) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Orangeburg, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1398) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pickens, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1399) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Spartanburg, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1400) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of St. Matthews, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1401) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sumter, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1402) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Saluda, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1403) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of St. George, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1404) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of York, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1405) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Walhalla, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1406) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Darlington, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1407) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of McCormick, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1408) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Moncks Corner, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1409) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ridgeland, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1410) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of York, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1411) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Walterboro, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1412) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Winnsboro, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1413) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Union, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1414) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Florence, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1415) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Georgetown, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1416) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dillon, S. C., one captured German cannon.

A bill (S. 1417) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gaffney, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1418) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Greenville, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1419) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Greenwood, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1420) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hampton, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1421) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Edgefield, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1422) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kingstree, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1423) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Laurens, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1424) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lexington, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1425) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lancaster, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1426) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Manning, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1427) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marion, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1428) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Anderson, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1429) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Allendale, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1430) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bamberg, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1431) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Barnwell, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1432) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Beaufort, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1433) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bennettsville, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1434) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bishopville, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1435) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Abbeville, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1436) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Camden, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1437) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Charleston, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1438) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chester, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1439) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chesterfield, S. C., one captured German cannon;

A bill (S. 1440) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Columbia, S. C., one captured German cannon; and

A bill (S. 1441) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Conway, S. C., one captured German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 46) extending until July 1, 1920, the effective date of section 10 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 47) authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of marriage and divorce; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 48) proposing an amendment to Article V of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUXILIARY ENGINEER CORPS.

Mr. RANDELL. By request I introduce a bill to create an auxiliary engineer corps in the United States Army for duty on works of public improvement, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 1376) to create an auxiliary engineer corps in the United States Army for duty on works of public improvement was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. RANDELL. To accompany the proposed bill is a brief statement explaining its purposes, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

Brief to accompany the proposed bill for an auxiliary engineer corps, under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

The purpose of this bill, briefly stated, is:

1. To provide an organization auxiliary to the Army Engineer Corps and subject to the orders of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in the discharge of his duties and needed for the efficient and economical performance of the Government work under his charge.

2. To provide an efficient working organization, complete from top to bottom, with a military status based solely upon the merit system and with provisions for continuity of service and moderate pay, but with sufficient inducement offered men to enter and remain in the organization as a chosen profession and life work, in which the lowest-paid employee may have a chance to make something out of himself if he is made of the right stuff. As the honor men of the West Point Military Academy furnish the personnel of the Army Engineer Corps, so shall our colleges and schools throughout the United States furnish their honor men for the proposed personnel of the auxiliary engineer corps through the civil service. The functions of this organization are clearly set forth in the bill.

3. To provide a complete business and engineering organization for all its departments in the field and office of highly trained and experienced men as a national after-the-war necessity to meet existing conditions that will put the United States on a par with England, which has its Corps of Royal Engineers, and with France, which has its Corps de Pont et Chaussée, that construct and take care of the public works, transportation, and highway facilities in those two countries.

4. To meet existing unusual conditions which defy and hinder economical progress, that can not be met except by the legislation proposed in this bill, to lift the Engineer Service at large out of the present ever-shifting conditions, and to give permanency and stability to the service. Men enter the service and use the training they receive to obtain better positions and better pay outside the Engineer Service. There are no means available and no inducements to offer any man to remain in the service. Conditions in this respect are growing worse. Experienced men who have been in the service for many years quit to better their conditions financially, and in many instances they more than double their pay by leaving the service. The loss of every trained and experienced man is a dead loss to the service as well as a financial loss to the Government, and what is worse, it reduces efficiency, hampers and cripples progress, and at times brings work to a standstill. On the other hand, the men quitting the service have nothing to lose but everything to gain financially. The proposed bill remedies all these defects. There is a remedy provided nearly in every section, that is called for by present conditions.

5. The proposed legislation will stabilize wages on public works and will have the same influence on the Nation's industries. It will eliminate strikes. No one has ever heard of or known of a strike within a military organization. The thing is impossible, unthinkable. The principles laid down in this bill when put to practice will provide the United States a well-organized and highly intelligent and scientific dependable working force, instead of the present force of individuals without esprit de corps, everyone for himself.

6. The three-year training period provided before a man can get into the permanent organization will call for those sound qualifications upon which the proposed organization will be built.

7. The Engineer Service at large now contains the men qualified and ready to be mobilized into the permanent organization, also some men who are in the three-year training period.

8. The war has revolutionized many ideas and given man's judgment a new setting. The legislation proposed by this bill is an evolution which is called for by conditions due to the war and for which there can be found no remedy except by an act of Congress. There is no other way to get out of the deep rut. All effort and progress now are like climbing up hill on roller skates; anyone who has ever tried the latter performance will understand the meaning.

9. It is not a change of engineers which the country called for, but a permanent organization with a military status, to consist of the experienced men trained in the Engineer Service, men with the special qualifications needed in the performance of our Nation's waterway work and with provision for filling its depleted ranks and under the orders and direction of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, so as to relieve the War Department of all duties not strictly military.

10. The proposed legislation is not a salary grasp; ability, length of service, and present pay establish the grade of the personnel in the auxiliary engineer corps, as shall be determined by the efficiency board provided in the bill.

11. The business men of this country will support this measure.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK.

Mr. KNOX submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 70), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL PAGES.

Mr. HARDING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 69), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to employ five additional pages for the Senate Chamber, at \$3 per day each, for a period lasting until the end of the present session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, to be paid from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate.

CALENDAR MONDAY.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that hereafter I shall insist upon the observance of the rule relating to Calendar Monday. This means that after the conclusion of routine morning business no Senator may speak or introduce any business not on the calendar so long as there is objection. I do this in order that the calendar may be considered during the morning hour on Mondays until 2 o'clock, as is contemplated by the rule. I give this notice now in order that Senators may understand that there will be nothing personal in any objection that I may make.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 3157. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

TREATY OF PEACE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was informed privately by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] that he wanted to call up his resolution.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I supposed that the resolution came up as a matter of right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The ruling of the Chair has been for four years that such resolutions do not come up unless they are called up.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to have the resolution laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska.

The Secretary proceeded to read the resolution.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry, and, if I may do so, I should like to make a preliminary statement before I submit the question. The Indian appropriation bill is on the calendar. I am very anxious to get it up this morning. I do not think it will take very long to dispose of it. It is important that this legislation should get through at the earliest date possible, and I want to ask if debate is in order on the pending resolution during the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is, after the routine morning business has been completed. It has been the invariable ruling that resolutions coming over were debatable.

Mr. CURTIS. Under Rule VIII it is provided that—

All motions made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be determined without debate.

Of course, the question is whether this resolution comes up as a matter of fact without motion. If it comes up as a matter of course it is subject to debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is quite clear about this matter. It was the custom of Presiding Officers prior to the induction into office of the present occupant of the chair to for-

mally lay before the Senate all resolutions coming over from a preceding day, but the present occupant of the chair has made the ruling, and the Senate has acquiesced in it, that he would not lay such resolutions before the Senate, but that the Senators who had submitted them should have the right to call them up before the close of morning business.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I shall not take up any more time, but I trust that the Senator from Nebraska will get through as soon as he can, because I should like to get up the Indian appropriation bill at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, of course I have no desire unduly to detain the Senate on this matter, and I have already assured the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] that I should not do so. I realize the great desirability of bringing before the Senate the appropriation bill to which the Senator from Kansas refers, but I have suggested to him that it would be a very easy matter under the circumstances for him to secure from the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] permission temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business, as we have done in many other cases, and then to put through the appropriation bill which he desires passed.

Mr. President, I ask first that the Secretary read the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 64), as follows:

Whereas the Senator from Idaho, Mr. BORAH, has stated in the Senate that certain interests in the city of New York have secured copies of the peace treaty with Germany while the American people have been unable to secure one; and

Whereas the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. LODGE, has stated in the Senate that he knows of four such copies of said treaty of peace with Germany now in New York and that the only place where it is not allowed to come is the United States Senate; and

Whereas the Senator from Idaho, Mr. BORAH, has stated that the interests now having possession of said copies of said treaty are peculiarly interested in the treaty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed to investigate the matter with a view to ascertaining the facts, and particularly to ascertain and report to the Senate the name of the persons, corporations, or interests which have secured copies of said treaty and from whom they were secured and by what methods, and also to ascertain and report to the Senate in what manner and to what extent said interests are "particularly" interested in said treaty. For these purposes the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it is, authorized to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with the same, the expenses thereof, including the cost of travel, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I assume that there will not be any very substantial objection to the adoption of this resolution. I realize that, as a proper formality, it must first be sent to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and I shall later on ask that that action be taken; but it seems to me a matter of the most tremendous urgency that an investigation should be had of the charge made upon the responsibility of two Senators upon the floor of the Senate that copies of the peace treaty with Germany have fallen into the hands of New York interests while being withheld from the Senate of the United States.

The demand for an investigation should have been made by the Senators who lugged into the Senate this very serious charge. They do not appear to have appreciated either the gravity of their own statements, or the embarrassing position in which they place themselves by not demanding an investigation. They declare, in effect, that the President of the United States withholds copies of this treaty from the Senate, and they insinuate very broadly that he permits copies to go to business concerns in New York City. These concerns, they say, have particular interest in the treaty, of which they have secured advance copies.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, I am ready to take all the blame that can be placed upon me by the Senator, but I wish he would not say "they." I said nothing whatever about financial interests.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall quote what the Senator said—

Mr. LODGE. I wish the Senator would.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And I assume when the Senator from Massachusetts, leading the main body of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber, and the Senator from Idaho, leading the other faction of his party, concur on the same day in making these charges and insinuations against a coordinate branch of the Government, that they are in accord, and that what one of them says is indorsed by the other. These New York concerns—

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Idaho has no objection to that statement, but he thinks that it may be a little harsh upon the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator from Massachusetts did not say anything about "special interests" at all, nor "particular interests," nor anything of that sort. I was sorry he did not; but he did not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, it is possible that the Senator from Massachusetts is in a slightly different attitude from the Senator from Idaho. They concurred, however, in their attack. Apparently these special New York interests having an interest in the treaty did not permit the Senator from Idaho to examine it while in their possession, whereas the Senator from Massachusetts appears to have been particularly favored. These New York concerns, they say, have particular interest in the terms of the treaty. This involves an attack upon the President of the United States of the most scandalous character.

It appears to be a new chapter in the attack on the treaty itself, a new chapter in which both of the Senators concur. It is done for the purpose of attacking the treaty. It conveys to the public mind the idea that there is a secret combination between the commission headed by the President in Paris and the business interests in New York, by which the latter are to be given advance information withheld from the Senate—a monstrous charge. Men who make such a charge owe it to the public to demand an investigation, and they would have demanded an investigation if they had been making a charge in the public interest and not merely for the purpose of injuring the great treaty and postponing the establishment of peace.

I was not in Washington on the day these senatorial statements and insinuations were made; but I searched the papers in vain to find a report of any demand by either of the Senators that the scandalous situation they pictured be investigated. Indeed, the Senator from Idaho went so far as to say upon the floor of the Senate that he did not want an investigation.

Personally I have no knowledge of this matter; I have never seen the treaty, nor asked to see it. I do not know the New York interests that have copies. If any New York interests have copies, they evidently have closer communication with the enemies of the treaty than with the friends of the treaty. I want to know how those New York interests got those copies, if they have them; the country wants to know; the Senate must find out. It is not sufficient to leave the matter to the confidential knowledge of the Senators who are fighting this treaty. We are all entitled to know what New York interests are using copies of this treaty in their business, not simply those Senators taken into the confidence of the aforesaid New York interests.

Mr. President, I shall not, unless it becomes necessary, take the time to quote into the RECORD all of the statements made by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Idaho on June 3, but I notice one statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts in which he says that he held in his hand yesterday a copy of the treaty and that it was offered to him to bring here. He says that it was not given to him, but that it still exists in New York.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Does he say why he would not accept it?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think he does.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What was the reason? I should like to have that go in the RECORD also; also the page from which the Senator is reading.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am reading from page 558; and as the Senator is so curious, I will read that paragraph.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should like to hear it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. (reading)—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I will now take occasion to say what I was going to say out of order when the request for unanimous consent was before us. Now, I will say in order upon the woman-suffrage joint resolution that the treaty is in New York. I had a copy of it in my hand yesterday, and I heard of several others. I was offered a copy to bring on here and show to my colleagues. I said that no copy could come into my hands without being made public.

It evidently did come into his hands without being made public; and, if we are to believe the reports, it rested in his hands for an hour and a half.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. He meant that he would not accept it and bring it down here unless he made it public.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not know any great moral advantage of such a treaty coming into the hands of the Senator from Massachusetts and being withheld from the hands of his associates. I can see no great moral boast in that. If he held the treaty in his hands, he held stolen goods—goods probably secured by bribery; goods which the President of the United States and other international representatives in Paris had

promised should not be made public, for public reasons, and in order that the negotiation of the treaty might not be interfered with—

Therefore, it was not given to me, but it is there in New York. I heard of four copies in existence in New York.

The Senator is very well advised, evidently, of these nefarious interests concerning which the Senator from Idaho has made some rather strong insinuations—

How many more there may be in the country I do not know; but, as far as I can make out, the only place where it is not allowed to come is the Senate of the United States.

That is a pretty strong statement for a Senator of the United States to make—that the President is withholding copies of the treaty from the Senate and permitting it to go everywhere else, and into the hands of concerns that have special interests in the treaty. How a Senator could have believed such a thing, and not have demanded an investigation, I do not understand.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will.

Mr. FALL. What information has the Senator that the President is withholding the treaty from the Senate?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. My information is of various characters; and it is a matter of world-wide notoriety that the representatives of the nations which made this treaty agreed, for the public interest and in the interest of an early peace, to withhold the publication of the copies until a result had been secured with Germany, just as has always been the case in the negotiation of treaties.

Mr. FALL. That is my understanding of the general situation—that is, that there should be no publicity given to the treaty—but I have not any information leading me to believe that the President has refused to give it to the Senate, because a treaty is given to the Senate in confidence, and publicity is not given to it except by the consent of the President or the Senate. We on this side, I am sure, have no information that the President would decline to give the Senate the treaty, but we have proof that the Senator from Nebraska is leading the opposition to an inquiry for the treaty. That is all we know about it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is going far afield from the issue which is now before the Senate.

Mr. FALL. I will come to that issue before we get through with it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. When we come to debate the question of whether the Senate of the United States should break into presidential negotiations, and demand the tentative copy of a treaty before it has been signed by the enemy, the Senator is going into a field in which he will find no precedent whatever for the Senate making any such meddlesome demand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And, if the Senator will pardon me, he is going into a field where George Washington denied that the Senate had the right to enter.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Absolutely.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to correct that statement a moment, the message of George Washington was to the House of Representatives; and he distinctly said that he had already furnished to the Senate of the United States all the information, including every particle of the evidence, every letter, and all communications.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is right about that. It does happen that the House did ask for the information.

Mr. FALL. Exactly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the President denied the right of the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. FALL. Oh, no. He denied it to the House, because of the publicity, and stated that he had already transmitted to the Senate of the United States all the information.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I desire to add, however, that he did not transmit it, or transmit anything, until after the treaty was completed and signed.

Mr. FALL. That is a question as between the Senator from Montana and historical records with reference to the matter and President Washington's own note to the House, to which reference has just been made.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, there is later authority on this question than George Washington.

Mr. BORAH. I was going to say, why do you quote George Washington? You have repudiated all his doctrines.

Mr. SWANSON. We have the illustrious Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] as a later authority on this question. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to read, for the edification of the Senator from New Mexico, what the distinguished

chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee said on this question. He is a very fine authority on the prerogatives of the Senate and the prerogatives of the President.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. FALL. The Senator from Virginia always edifies the Senator from New Mexico. I shall be glad to have him pursue his ordinary course.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from Massachusetts is the latest authority we have, in 1906.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, that was during the administration of a Republican President, was it not?

Mr. SWANSON. I was about to suggest that. I want to show what the Senator's views were when a Republican President was engaged in negotiations and a demand was made by some Democrats for certain information. I should like to put in a later authority on that point. This was the Algeciras conference, and Senator Bacon was trying to get some information with reference to it.

Mr. BORAH. May I make a suggestion? That has been read some twenty-five or thirty times. May I suggest that we have a special print of it, so that we will have ready access to it?

Mr. SWANSON. I shall be very glad to have printed the portion of it that I shall read:

He is entitled under the Constitution to come here and join with us in the consideration of treaties or other executive business. As a matter of fact, that was never done but by Washington, and it has been abandoned ever since, although the right remains recognized by our rule to-day. Yet I think we should be disposed to resent it if a request of that sort was made to us by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I repeat we are justly jealous of our own prerogatives and our own rights, but we can not maintain them or insist upon them unless we are equally observant of the prerogatives and the rights of the other departments of the Government. It is a mere invasion of the powers and rights of the President if we are to plunge in at a stage of the negotiation where we have no business whatever and demand from him the instructions which he has given to his properly appointed representatives. When the treaty made by those representatives comes before us, then is the time, and not before, in which we can properly ask for information in regard to all which led up to it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator to ask a question?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the date of that?

Mr. SWANSON. January 24, 1906, when there was a Republican President.

Mr. NORRIS. That was before the promulgation of the doctrine of "open covenants of peace, openly arrived at." It does not apply now.

Mr. SWANSON. That does not change the constitutional right.

Let me give another suggestion to the Senator from Massachusetts, which, I think, has not been put. As was suggested to me by a distinguished Senator the other day, it would be just as right and just as just if the President were to send word to us that, if not incompatible with the public interest, he would be obliged if we would send him our secret Journal.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In conclusion, Mr. President, I have very little to say. The Senator from Massachusetts has gone on record in the declaration that this treaty is under the control of the President of the United States; that the United States has no representatives in Paris besides the President. He has made the statement, almost flat-footed, that those representatives, under the control of the President of the United States, have given out copies of this treaty. He states that there are at least four, and I think he really said five, copies extant in New York at the present time. The Senator from Idaho indorses what he says, and declares that those treaties are in the hands of interests which are using them for private purposes, because they are interested in the terms of the treaty.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, the Senator from Idaho asserted the right to print it in the Record, while the Senator from Massachusetts would not even bring it to the Senate at all. That is where they differ.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Now, I say the time has come for an investigation. I want to know what interests the Senator from Massachusetts has been talking to. I want to know what interests there are which are denounced by the Senator from Idaho as having special interests in the terms of this treaty. I want to know how those interests got possession of copies of this treaty, and hold them in New York at the present time, and confidentially discuss them with Senators of the United States. I think the people of the United States have a right to know, and therefore I ask that this resolution be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Nebraska would not talk in such a violent way. He frightens me, he frightens the Senate, when he gets so violent.

Let me say to my friend from Virginia—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I hope the Senator will not construe as violence what is simply a robust voice gathered upon the plains of the West.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know where it was gathered.

I want to say to the Senator from Virginia that that paragraph from my speech, which has been read here repeatedly—I think the Senator from Idaho understated it when he said it had been read twenty-five times—is just as correct and true today as it was then, absolutely. We can not compel the President to send anything here, and what I spoke about was asking for instructions, his instructions to his representatives. We are not asking for instructions. We are asking for a public document, and he can refuse it if he sees fit.

Now, Mr. President, let me come to the question of the investigation, which I shall be delighted to have ordered. I went to the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate this morning and said that I hoped he would get through this morning this resolution getting authority from the Committee to Audit and Control. To my surprise I found that the Senator from Nebraska, who is in such a state of hurry and haste, had had it put over, so that I could not get it before the Senate this morning. If I had had my way we would have passed it and begun the investigation at once. I shall be delighted to have it come to my committee, which is also the committee of the Senator from Idaho, and we will investigate each other with great pleasure.

The Senator finds fault that we did not carry on an investigation in New York. I am not aware that we have any authority to carry on investigations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Oh, Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. Let me finish. I did not interrupt the Senator.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But the Senator is misrepresenting my statement and my position, and I am sure he does not desire to do that. What I criticized the Senator for was not demanding an investigation in the Senate, as I have now demanded it.

Mr. LODGE. I noted down that the Senator said, "should have investigated."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; the Senator is entirely mistaken. I have it here in writing.

Mr. LODGE. At all events, I saw no reason why we should undertake an investigation in New York.

Now, let me state all that the committee can possibly find out from me. I will state it now. It will save time.

I was shown a copy of the treaty with Germany by a friend of mine who is connected with no interest, but is entirely a private citizen. How it came into his hands I did not inquire. He is a man of the utmost uprightness of character. If I were at liberty to mention his name, which I am not, the whole country would know that there never was a more outrageous suggestion than to suppose that anything could have come into his hands by corruption. It came to him, I have not any question, in a perfectly legitimate way; I have no knowledge how.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. Day before yesterday the Senator spoke of four copies of the existence of which he had knowledge.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me to tell my poor little story in my own way, I will come to that.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I stand rebuked by the unconscious arrogance of conscious power and will take my seat.

Mr. LODGE. There is no arrogance to it; but the Senator is trying to tell it, and no doubt can tell it much better than I. I wanted to go on and tell it in my own way, and then he can tell it in his way afterwards.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely asked a question, Mr. President, and I am sorry that I interrupted the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I am coming to it if the Senator will permit me. I think I have at least the right to tell it in my own way. I had the floor.

I was going on to say that that copy I had an opportunity to examine, at least one article of it. The text of the treaty covers 208 folio pages. The whole treaty, French and English text both, covers 415 pages. The English text covers 208 small folio pages, as I recall. The only part that I acquired any sort of familiarity with was an article at the end, which seemed to be a sort of addendum to the body of the treaty with Germany, because it had nothing to do with the peace with Germany, but which established, at great length—I think it is as long as the

league of nations article; that is a mere guess, but I should think so—a great and permanent organization for the internationalization of labor, a very interesting article. I was afterwards told by another gentleman, wholly unconnected with any great business or financial interests in any way, that he also had a copy, which he would allow me to take and examine at length; and I told him I preferred not to take any copy to bring here, because any copy that was put into my hands I should feel it my duty to make public. It was this gentleman who said to me that he knew of four copies in New York. That is merely hearsay. I know personally of only two.

I saw nobody representing a financial interest. I did not go within 2 or 3 miles of Wall Street. Therefore I can not bear testimony as to the possession of copies of the treaty by financial interests. But it was stated by the State Department when they were explaining what I had said and what I had seen, although the State Department was not with me when I saw it. They said that they thought I must have seen parts of the treaty which were in the hands of financial interests in New York. I suggest, when you begin to investigate, you investigate your own department at the start. They said that publicly. It was published in the newspapers.

Nobody has denied the presence of those copies here or in New York. Of course, there is a copy here in the State Department, and I have no doubt that Senators more favored than I have seen it. Those copies are here. How they came I do not pretend to say. They must have come from Paris. They must have been given out by somebody who had control of them. I do not pretend to say who did it. I only know they are here in this country and, on the authority of the State Department, that they are in the hands of some of the financial interests. That is not my statement.

Now, Mr. President, that is all I could suggest to any committee.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator state who in the State Department made that statement and to whom it was made?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Frank Polk made it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. To whom?

Mr. LODGE. He made it to the press, and it was printed in the press that evening.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is willing sometimes to take the press statements, but I notice on other occasions he discredits them.

Mr. LODGE. I am not fond of speaking of private conversation, but I know personally that the statement was given. That is all I can give in the way of testimony. That is all I shall give. It would be on my part a gross breach of faith to state the names of the two gentlemen, who are friends of mine, who told me they had copies. That I shall decline, of course, to give; but anything beyond that question which the Senator from Nebraska thinks he will find serviceable I shall be only too happy to give, and I will call before the committee every-one he can suggest.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Including the peace commission?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; including the peace commission, if I can reach them. I shall be very glad to find out the whole of it. That is the whole story, as far as I know it.

Mr. FALL. If the Senator from Massachusetts will allow me a moment—

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. FALL. Does not the Senator think it would be a good idea to call before the Senate Committee the Senator from Nebraska himself, who a few days since in the Senate stated definitely of his own knowledge certain things with reference to this treaty, knowledge which none in this body has except as communicated by him. I refer to his statement with reference to the resolution of the Senator from California, made on the 23d of May and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. For instance, he said that he can state definitely that no publication of this treaty had been made in any country whatsoever, and yet the public press notifies us of the fact that it has been made and is on sale in a book of 415 pages to-day, in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, or in any neutral countries of the Continent as well as in Germany. He has made the statement, as I understand him, that he knew the President of the United States wanted the treaty made public. He said:

I do not know that I am going too far, but I feel justified in saying that the President of the United States would have no objection, so far as the United States and the people of the United States are concerned, to the full publication of this document, but it can not be published in the United States without getting back to other countries.

As I say, I hesitate to go too far in stating things that I believe I know; but I do know that it would be a cause of infinite embarrassment, particularly in France, to make public at this time the present terms of the demands being made on Germany.

I suggest in the investigation the chairman should investigate as to the source of knowledge of the one member of this committee who apparently has some confidential knowledge which the other Members of the Senate have not.

Mr. LODGE. Of course the Senator from Nebraska is a leading and most distinguished member of the Foreign Relations Committee. He is right there, and he can investigate himself while he is investigating us. That is all very easily done.

Mr. President, the whole thing is very simple. There is no question about the fact that copies of the treaty with Germany are in this country. That is admitted by the State Department, and I can bear witness to having seen one. There is no question whatever that they are on sale in neutral countries, as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] has just said.

Now, I can see no good reason why we should not have from the State Department the official copy of the text of a treaty which the rest of the world has no difficulty in procuring. But if the President thinks there is any reason why we should not have it, why does he not tell us so, and the whole demand would cease at once? Yet we know nothing but this hearsay, what the newspapers say, and what the Senator from Nebraska thinks the President thinks. One word would stop it.

Mr. FALL and Mr. HITCHCOCK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Will the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. I presume the Senator would not consider the sending of the treaty to the Senate as imparting instructions to us to publish it, or as necessarily followed by a publication of the treaty.

Mr. LODGE. Not in the least. All treaties are marked confidential, and they are published only when we take off the injunction of secrecy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a moment ago I said that George Washington had denied the right which is sought here. The Senator from New Mexico very properly said that matter happened to come before George Washington in the shape of a resolution from the House of Representatives. I then stated that he was perfectly correct about the source, but that the language which Gen. Washington used was equally applicable to either branch of the National Legislature. I shall quote that language now.

Mr. President, I am reading from one of the ablest recent presentations of the constitutional power of the United States as related to world affairs and treaty rights. It comes from the pen of the former Senator from Utah, Mr. Sutherland, one of the three greatest lawyers who have been in this body since I have been here—one of the best international lawyers. I can not find the original, but I am quoting it as quoted by him in this book.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. FALL. Does ex-Senator Sutherland attempt to set out the entire letter of Washington or only a part of it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. He sets out so much of it as applies to the particular question that you and I are now discussing.

Mr. FALL. But he does not set out that portion of it which the Senator admitted was contained in the letter, to the effect that he had already communicated to the Senate all these documents.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; but not on the demand to the Senate nor by its right. The language that Gen. Washington used is this:

The nature of foreign negotiations requires caution, and their success must often depend on secrecy; and even when brought to a conclusion a full disclosure of all the measures, demands, or eventual concessions which may have been proposed or contemplated would be extremely impolitic; for this might have a pernicious influence on future negotiations or produce immediate inconveniences, perhaps danger and mischief, in relation to other powers—

That is, foreign powers—

The necessity of such caution and secrecy was one cogent reason for vesting the power of making treaties in the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, the principle upon which that body was formed confining it to a small number of members.

Then he goes on to deny the special right of the House of Representatives to make a demand of that sort.

Now, then, I want to quote a little from ex-Senator Sutherland in connection with this point. Then I shall quote a little from, perhaps, the ablest diplomatist and international lawyer that the other side has furnished to the country since the Civil War, with two exceptions—Senator Spooner, of Wisconsin. From ex-Senator Sutherland I now quote. He tells how in the convention forming the Constitution the framers had a great deal of dispute as to with whom should be left the treaty-

making power, some of them wanting to imitate the example of Great Britain and leave it exclusively with the Executive, others wanting to go to the opposite extreme and leave it to the House of Representatives. Then ex-Senator Sutherland says:

In the end the plan which was finally adopted commended itself to the good sense of the convention as insuring preliminary secrecy and expedition whenever necessary, without losing the benefit of the thorough consideration and popular approval which would result from the independent action of the Senate, in which every State would have an equal vote and an equal opportunity of being heard. Negotiation with foreign Governments is a matter of such delicacy that it can be carried on far better by a single person, like the President, than by a large number of officials, like the Senate, while the combined judgment of the larger number, including both President and Senate, respecting the value and wisdom of the result of the negotiation will generally prove a safer reliance.

The unwisdom of premature and sometimes of ultimate public disclosure of treaty or other negotiations with foreign Governments is so clear that the refusal of President Washington to accede to a request from the House of Representatives to lay before that body the instructions, correspondence, and documents relating to the negotiation of the Jay treaty was approved by the House itself, and has ever since been recognized as establishing a wise precedent for subsequent guidance.

Now, Mr. President, our forefathers happened to be in that particular generation very remarkable men in their knowledge of what had been taking place upon the earth in connection with the formation of governments and the carrying of them on. They finally decided that so far as the negotiation of a treaty was concerned it should be left with the Executive, untrammelled, unworried, unbothered by anybody, and that so far as the making of a treaty was concerned, after the result of the negotiation was made known, that it should be the deliberate action of this body, representing in equal numbers the separate States of the Union, this Government being combined of these United States.

One of the three or four ablest men who have appeared upon the other side of the Chamber since the Civil War was former Senator Spooner, of the State of Wisconsin. Senator Spooner said, on page 1418 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 23, 1906:

I believe that it is not a proper course to be pursued by the Senate in respect to our foreign relations, save in extraordinary circumstances, if at all.

That was in connection with a resolution that had been introduced by the late Senator from Georgia, Mr. Bacon, then upon the Foreign Relations Committee, wanting to know the status of the negotiation which the then President of the United States was carrying on.

The Senate—

Says Senator Spooner—

has nothing whatever to do with the negotiation of treaties or the conduct of our foreign intercourse and relations save the exercise of the one constitutional function of advice and consent, which the Constitution requires as a precedent condition to the making of a treaty.

Not the negotiation of it.

Except as to the participation in the treaty-making power, the Senate, under the Constitution, has obviously neither responsibilities nor power.

Mr. President, this comes with a good deal of weight when you consider the man who uttered it. He was by long odds the ablest man in connection with our foreign affairs I have known in this Chamber, except, perhaps, two others.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will continue reading, if the Senator will pardon me, until I finish this part from Mr. Spooner.

Mr. FALL. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS (reading)—

From the foundation of the Government it has been conceded in practice and in theory that the Constitution vests the power of negotiation and the various phases—and they are multifarious—of the conduct of our foreign relations exclusively in the President. And, Mr. President, he does not exercise that constitutional power, nor can he be made to do it, under the tutelage or guardianship of the Senate or of the House or of the Senate and House combined.

Mr. President, from the beginning of this discussion down to now there has been a plain, palpable, and obvious effort and desire, or something that looked like it, to nag and worry and bedevil the President of the United States, not with regard to the making of a treaty but with regard to its negotiation, and every possible step has been taken to create in foreign countries the impression that his own people are not behind him. Instead of leaving him to his constitutional function, and then considering what he has done after he has done it and brought it here, you have been constantly suggesting and nagging and worrying and bedeviling, and you are up to it now.

Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts talks as if the treaty had been completed. The treaty not only has not been completed but we are in negotiation with Germany right now about its modification in certain respects, and it was a very wise thing upon the part of the President not to send a part of the

treaty here, or the treaty in process of negotiation, instead of waiting until after it was finally negotiated. The treaty has not been negotiated yet. The other side to the treaty—Germany, Austria, Turkey—has not yet signed it. The other side to the treaty has requested modifications, and the latest news shows that, as far as the financial part of the treaty is concerned, there are going to be modifications. And yet you want your own Executive, charged by the Constitution with the exclusive right—not under your tutelage at all—of negotiating treaties, to send to you parts of the negotiations in process of construction. From day to day, I suppose, he ought to have sent you just what they had done the day before, according to these gentlemen, and then correct the day after to-morrow what they had undone the day before.

As to this particular matter of copies of the treaty being in New York, I will undertake to wager a doughnut or two that when we come to find out who has these treaties, who has these copies of the treaty, we will find that they are Republicans, and that the man who first brought back a copy, or several copies, of the treaty is a Republican, and a high financial magnate in the Republican Party.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just one moment. Now, then, as to how the copies could have gotten here, I can imagine only one honest way in which they could have come. The German commissioners violated faith, published the treaty, and sent it not only over Germany but over neutral countries. They afterwards apologized for it, and said that the publication had taken place at Berlin contrary to their will and without their consent. It is possible that one of these copies in French and in German and in English, which I am informed are on the streets in Holland, in Denmark, and in some other parts of the world, have been gotten hold of honestly; but the insinuation, if such an insinuation is intended—and I hope it is not—that the President gave it to some interests somewhere, while declining to give it to the Senate of the United States, or that somebody in the President's confidence, by the President's consent, did it, is a thing which I repel, and I do not believe is true.

Now I will yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I will not interrupt the Senator now, but I shall try to get the floor later.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

Now, Mr. President, there are those who think that this Government has been awkwardly constructed—the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is not one of them, I am glad to say—and that our forefathers blundered in many respects. Some people think that we ought not to have had a Government limited by the will of the people as expressed in the Constitution at all, but that it ought to have been left, as the British Parliament is left, to do whatever we thought was well and right. There are others who think that all of the lines of demarcation between the powers of the respective parts of the Federal Government in the Constitution are "more honored in the breach than the observance."

I believe that the Constitutional Convention did one of the wisest things it ever did when it put the treaty-making power just exactly as it did—in its first stage of *negotiation*, for the purpose of secrecy and surety and for keeping the confidence amongst nations and amongst States, exclusively in the hands of the President of the United States, for, as George Washington says here:

The nature of foreign negotiations requires caution, and their success must often depend on secrecy; and even when brought to a conclusion a full disclosure of all the measures * * * proposed or contemplated would be extremely impolitic.

As Senator Spooner says in what I read you a moment ago, the very purpose and object of giving the President exclusive negotiatory power, as contradistinguished from the treaty-making power, was that the whole treaty power might work effectively. You can not carry the negotiations of a treaty to the newsboys on the street and have their votes as to what you are going to do next.

The President of the United States had a right to do what he has done; he was wise in doing it; and the proceedings in this body demonstrate his wisdom, for in so far as we have interfered we have interfered only to mar and not to mend.

Then when it came to the making of a treaty the framers of the Constitution were also wise there. They said that while we will entrust negotiations exclusively to the Executive, we will not trust the final result to him; he must take into his confidence then the ambassadors from the States who represent these United States in this Union and who are assembled in the Senate of the United States. So they made him do that.

Then, thinking further that the other House—the direct representatives of the people—were not consulted, they said, "We

will make it safe by requiring two-thirds of the Senators present to vote affirmatively in favor of a ratification before a treaty shall be valid and binding. We feel assured that two-thirds of the Senators will never do anything in connection with our foreign affairs that a majority of the House of Representatives would not be in accord with."

Mr. President, if this copy or these copies of the treaty have not come by getting hold of the German copies, and if they have come to any special interests—and it will be discovered later on that the head of the interests is a Republican—then they must have been gotten out in some wrongful way; and if so, that is not a thing to be proud of.

So far as I am concerned, it seems to me, now that the Germans have published the treaty, it does not make much difference whether it is published everywhere else or by us or not; but the President has made an agreement with these other peoples that the treaty was not to be published until it was completely negotiated and until Germany had signed it. And, by the way, that is only courtesy and comity to Germany, enemy as she is. She did not live up to it; she violated the trust reposed in her. A part of the consideration that led men to come to that conclusion of temporary secrecy was that we ought to wait until the other side to the treaty has agreed to it before we send it to our own people—until Germany, Austria, Turkey, and Bulgaria have signed up.

The treaty can not be sent to the Senate until the negotiations are completed, and the negotiations can not be completed until Germany and the others have signed. It begins to look as though Germany is not going to sign, and that we shall have to go to Berlin. When we go to Berlin we shall have a different treaty. If we are forced to go to Berlin we are not going to be satisfied with the present treaty. There will then be other exactions. There will have to be additions to it.

Now, how are Senators helping the United States in Europe in these negotiations? Is what you are saying here in the shape of carping and criticism helping your representatives there? Are you gaining for them the greater confidence of neutrals and enemies and friends by what you are doing and saying here? If you are destroying that confidence, are you doing it deliberately and for a set purpose, or are you doing it accidentally and just out of pure foolishness? Which is it?

I think, Mr. President, that I have demonstrated the fact that the language of George Washington would apply to the Senate as well as to the other House, although the language which I have quoted was used in reply to a House resolution.

I wish merely to state this before I conclude: It has been universally admitted that the President's power of negotiation is so exclusive that he may make a treaty, have it signed, and then pocket it, as Thomas Jefferson did in the case of a treaty with Great Britain; or the President may send the treaty to the Senate, the Senate may amend it, and then he may pocket it at the White House, as Taft did in reference to the British arbitration treaty, because he declined to pursue the negotiation any further, and the Senate had no right to negotiate and no method of doing it, because that was the President's exclusive power and his exclusive right. As Taft said, you remember, "I merely put that treaty on the shelf, waiting for the people to elect a new Senate"; and he added, in his very felicitous and facetious way—he was the best loser, by the way, that America has ever had—"but the people instead of changing the Senate changed me," and the treaty is still on the shelf at the White House. He did, however, what he had a right to do and what everybody knew he had a right to do, as did Washington and Jefferson and Madison in the cases with which Senators are, or ought to be, acquainted.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the Senator, of course, pursues one of the methods of argument by reading a portion of a document proving his point and declining or failing to read the other portion. In Senator Sutherland's work he was commenting upon a certain condition which might exist and giving his views with reference to the publicity of pending treaty negotiations or the publicity of certain documents after a treaty had been concluded. For the purposes of his argument no more than for the purposes of the Senator's argument was it necessary for him to disclose the entire facts of the case. It would not have been, however, at all disastrous, in so far as the argument was concerned which Senator Sutherland was making, to have disclosed the entire George Washington letter, but it would have been disastrous to the Senator if he was attempting to make any argument to disclose the entire Washington letter.

The House of Representatives called upon Washington by joint resolution for certain letters from and to foreigners during the negotiations in connection with a treaty. The treaty had been communicated to the Senate of the United States prior to that time, and the treaty was ratified by the Senate, I

may say. The House of Representatives for the purpose of openly discussing not the treaty itself, because the seal of secrecy had at that time been removed from the treaty, but for the purpose of discussing the actions of certain negotiators and certain private information upon which the negotiators acted, requested this information from the President. The present occupant of the chair [Mr. POMERENE in the chair] will of course recall at that time that all sessions of the Senate of the United States were secret; there were no open debates in the Senate. In the House of Representatives the debates were open. President Washington replied, making the argument exactly as it has been read by the Senator against publicity of the negotiations or of private documents in public debate in the House of Representatives, but stated to the House of Representatives that he had sent every one of the papers requested by them, together with all of the other papers in the case, to the constitutional body entitled to their possession, the Senate of the United States. That statement is made in the same Washington letter.

I asked to interrupt the Senator for a moment while he was reading Senator Spooner's remarks, to request that he read Senator Bacon's remarks at that time. Senator Bacon was a very eminent and very prominent Senator, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of this body for many years, and died as the chairman of that committee. It was his resolution to which Senator Spooner was objecting.

There are some Senators in this body, Mr. President, who are sticklers for precedent and who do not agree with the President of the United States, or at least with the declarations of the President of the United States, with reference to open diplomacy and "open covenants openly arrived at." I am sorry to say that there are many Senators upon my side of the Chamber who insist that all treaties should be discussed behind closed doors, with the audience excluded from the galleries. I am not one of those Senators. I think, sir, as the President said—and I shall not undertake to quote his words—when he addressed this body and the other body with reference to the Brest-Litovsk treaty which had just been made, a new era had come, and he congratulated Lenin and Trotsky and the Bolsheviks that they insisted upon conducting the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk openly and publishing the treaty broadcast.

While the President of the United States should be pretty fair authority, and despite the fact that once before his sentiments upon this particular subject at issue have been read into the Record, yet in view of the fact that fifteen or twenty times the sentiments of Senator Spooner or the words of Senator Spooner and the words of Senator Lodge and others have been read into the Record, I shall presume upon the time of the Senate to call attention again, specifically, to the President's ideas entertained prior to this time, at least, and even later, when he addressed the Congress of the United States upon the German Bolshevik treaty. Referring to the President, he says:

But there is another course which the President may follow, and which one or two Presidents of unusual political sagacity have followed, with the satisfactory results that were to have been expected. He may himself be less stiff and offish, may himself act in the true spirit of the Constitution, and establish intimate relations of confidence with the Senate on his own initiative, not carrying his plans to completion, and then laying them in final form before the Senate, to be accepted or rejected, but keeping himself in confidential communication with the leaders of the Senate while his plans are in course, when their advice will be of service to him and his information of the greatest service to them, in order that there may be veritable counsel and a real accommodation of views, instead of a final challenge and contest. The policy which has made rivals of the President and Senate has shown itself in the President as often as in the Senate, and if the Constitution did intend that the Senate should in such matters be an executive council it is not only the privilege of the President to treat it as such, it is also his best policy and his plain duty. (Woodrow Wilson's Constitutional Government in the United States, ch. 5 (1917).)

Mr. President, I have maintained since my entrance into public life that secret diplomacy was the greatest evil which our democracy was compelled to confront, that there lay more injury and more evil to the body politic, to the people, to our Government itself, and to the perpetuity of our American institutions in secret diplomacy than in all other weaknesses contained in our form of government or written in our Constitution combined. If precedent as established is followed in the treatment of this matter now at issue—and precedent, of course, will be insisted upon even by those who under different conditions or at different times have urged an opposite point of view—as it is now being insisted upon, the great people of the United States will know nothing about this treaty until it is published, if it is ratified. They know nothing about it now, and it appears that they are practically the only people in the world who are in ignorance of it. They are not to be informed of it, and, finally, under the forms of precedent, it will be communicated secretly by the President of the United States when he brings it back with him to this Chamber, which will, upon motion of some Senator or

Senators, proceed to close its doors and consider this treaty changing the form of the Government of the United States, in secrecy from the people whose Government it is.

Senators insist upon precedent in this matter. Why, Mr. President, a portion of the treaty, a tentative draft of the treaty, was brought back by the President of the United States, and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House were called into consultation by him. He presented it to them; they discussed the matter there. What was the purpose? Why should he have presented a portion of the treaty to them, and why should his associates here, or his counsellors in the Senate, insist that he does not want the other portion of the treaty presented, confidentially at least, to us?

They may be right. The Senator from Nebraska is always assuming knowledge which he does not impart to us. He has intimate sources of knowledge, doubtless. He may be justified in saying that the President of the United States does not want the true text of this treaty to come before the Senate, and be considered by it, either publicly or privately. However, Mr. President, in view of the many declarations of the President of the United States upon this subject, unless I have a definite assurance that the President has so stated—not intimated to some Senator, in whose word, of course, I will have confidence—I must say that I doubt the objection of the President of the United States to a consideration of the treaty as so far agreed upon.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator conceive conditions to exist in Europe that might call for withholding the publication of the treaty from the public until after it had been submitted to the German representatives and they had full opportunity to discuss it and present it to their Government, and perhaps their Government had opportunity to take advices from various parts of the—Empire, I was about to say? I will withdraw the word "Empire" and say "the Republic of Germany."

Mr. FALL. I can conceive of such conditions, but only upon the assumption that the people of France do not want this treaty, and therefore that the negotiators are afraid to give publicity to it, or that the people of England do not want the treaty, and therefore that their negotiators decline to give it to them.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think that the delegates from Germany themselves would request that the treaty be withheld from the public until they had an opportunity to examine it and to communicate its contents to their Government?

Mr. FALL. Oh, the Senator may be correct. Germany may have made such a request. Of that I have no knowledge. I do not know whether she has or not. Has the Senator seen any suggestion that Germany has requested that it be kept private?

Mr. KING. I have seen some intimation in some of the press to the effect that the German delegates asked that knowledge of the terms of the treaty be withheld from the public.

Mr. FALL. Well, I have not. There were no German delegates until the treaty was prepared and presented to them.

Mr. KING. I understand; but I mean after it was presented to them. Does not the Senator think also that a treaty of this character, where it was only tentative—that is to say, it had not been agreed upon by the other side, and they had not presented any definitive terms—should be withheld from the public until the other side had an opportunity to examine its contents and to make their suggestions, if they had any to make, of changes or modifications which they regarded as essential to secure their rights and perhaps to secure the support of their Government?

Mr. FALL. The course which the Senator has suggested is, of course, one which has been almost universally followed in the past history of the world; but it has been said that it was so followed because it was in the power of those who were in absolute control of the countries of the world to make treaties of peace or treaties of commerce or treaties of alliance, offensive or defensive, without the knowledge of their constituents or of their subjects, and that it was not the business of the subjects. It was under conditions of that kind that this precedent was established. The President of the United States himself has called attention to it much more eloquently than I can. We had all hoped that those conditions had been so changed that the negotiations for this peace might be open.

Now, as to our own attitude and as to what I think, replying further to the Senator, allow me to say this:

Great Britain and France and Italy and the other Allies had been at war with the German Empire for several years before the United States entered the war. These nations, including Russia, had a treaty—a hard and fast treaty—nego-

tiated between the representatives of those countries, and under their constitutions binding upon the countries themselves, not submitted to their people in any way whatsoever. They had entered into a treaty by which it was agreed that Russia would not make peace with Germany or with the Central Powers without the consent of Italy, France, and Great Britain; that Great Britain would not make peace with Germany or the Central Powers without the consent of France, Italy, and Russia, and each of the other nations was bound by that treaty.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. FALL. Let me conclude my sentence. Each of the other nations was bound by that treaty. We knew that treaty to exist when we entered the war. The Congress of the United States declared that the acts of the German Empire constituted war, and that we declared the state of war thus thrust upon us to exist. We did not declare war against Germany, as the Senator recalls, directly. We made that declaration, knowing that the Allies had this agreement between themselves, that they would meet in common at the peace table, and that neither would sign any agreement of any kind or character with any or all of the Central Powers without the consent of the others, or unless the others also signed it.

Now, that far I am correct. If the Senator wishes to ask me a question, I will yield at this point.

Mr. KING. I was not quite sure whether I apprehended the meaning of the Senator; and I wanted to ask him whether he felt that it was an act for which the Allies should be criticized, when they were in a war for their very existence, that they entered into treaties, offensive and defensive, and those treaties stipulated that neither should make a treaty of peace with the enemy without the consent of all?

Mr. FALL. Oh, no; oh, no. I have not the remotest idea of criticizing the Allies. Anything is justifiable under the plea of self-defense, as the Senator knows well as a lawyer. This was a perfectly justifiable act, of course, and I am not attempting to criticize it at all; but I am stating the historical and record facts, that the United States did not enter into any such alliance with those States. It could not have done so, except by negotiations carried on through the President, presented to and ratified by this body. Therefore, I can say that this Government had no understanding of any kind or character with reference to the signing of peace treaties with the other Allies. Is not that statement correct, as the Senator understands?

Mr. KING. As I understand the statement, I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. FALL. Very well.

Mr. KING. But it does not seem to me that the mere fact that there was a treaty, to which the Senator has referred, between the Allies before we entered into the war changes the proposition as to the propriety, if those making the treaty thought that such was the proper course to pursue, of withholding knowledge of the treaty from the public until certain conditions had been complied with, or until the treaty had been submitted to the enemy and they were perfectly willing that it should be disclosed to the public.

Mr. FALL. The Senator has asked me a question as to my judgment about these matters, and I will proceed to give it. I am trying to give it logically, and I will reach the point he is speaking of right now. I have it in mind.

Mr. President, remember that we were not a party to any treaty as to how the terms of peace should be arrived at. Remember that the President of the United States had solemnly said to the Congress of the United States and to the people of the United States that with the causes of this war we were not concerned; we had nothing to do with it. Remember that only recently the Vice President, the presiding officer of this body, has publicly stated that he was ashamed to acknowledge—I am not attempting to quote his words, but I think this is what he said, in effect—that for years he had believed that we had nothing to do with or nothing in common with those who were fighting this war, that our interests were not as theirs, and that he had changed his opinion. The President of the United States notified the people of the United States that with the causes of this war—whether they might be ethnological, whether they might be geographical, whether this war might have been brought about because there were certain numbers of alien people within the boundaries of a certain geographical division, irrespective of the cause of the war itself—this country was not concerned. Many of us disagreed with him at that time. I am frank to say that I am one who disagreed; but he held that opinion.

Therefore, when this country entered the war, in every communication to foreign Governments and to our own people on the subject, the President of the United States treated the Allies not as allies of this country, but, to use his own expres-

sion, as those countries with which we were associated in fighting the war; and I defy any Senator to read every remark made by the President upon this subject and to point out to me where he has not, with all his magnificent ability in handling language, declined to commit himself to the fact that we were allies of Great Britain, France, Russia, Italy, or of the other combatant countries. Not only do I defy you to show where he has ever intimated that we were allies, but, with his usual insight and discernment in the use of words, he has used a word which would convey to any mind the distinction which he has clearly in mind and which, up to the time when he went to Europe, he undoubtedly insisted that the people of the United States should bear in mind.

Now, sir, what were the causes of the war, as he set them forth in his message to the Congress of the United States? I am not going to undertake to quote them. Senators remember why we went to war with Germany—why the President of the United States stated that we were justifiable in declaring a state of war to exist, which he did ask us to declare to exist. Not one word with reference to the thousand and one matters which he is now considering through the assistance of the geographical and ethnological experts, who have overrun the streets of Paris; not one word of any invitation or desire upon his part that we should divide the roundheads from the longheads in Europe and set aside to each of them, or to the Czechs or to the Teutons, a certain geographical division. I say that the President of the United States might well have followed the example of other Presidents before he proceeded to Europe. He might well have taken counsel with himself; he might well have acquired the frame of mind which he was undoubtedly in when he wrote those words which I have read into the RECORD. If he had any idea of entering into such negotiations as he is now embarked upon he might well have taken counsel with himself and followed the example of other illustrious Presidents and consulted the Senate of the United States before he proceeded to bind himself hard and fast to Great Britain, to France, to Italy, and to the other allied countries of whom we are only associates.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator mean to suggest in the statement he has just made that the President of the United States or that the Government, in dealing with the Central Powers after their defeat, should have conducted negotiations separate and apart from the governments with which our Government was associated during the war?

Mr. FALL. I mean just exactly that. I mean, sir, that the United States of America was entitled to deal, through its President as negotiator, with the German Empire, Austria, and their allies, and that upon making their peace we should have declared it, brought our soldiers home, and they should be here now, in my judgment, and restored the conditions prior to the war, or agreed upon new conditions upon which our people might do business with the German people.

Mr. KING. Then, as I understand—

Mr. FALL. Pardon me; I am going to answer the Senator. That is my judgment and it is my judgment of what should be done to-day. Then, as we were associated with these other people, and as the people of the United States of America are a peaceful people; as the people of America, while a great warlike people, are not a military people; as the people of the United States of America want peace forever, and will never change the condition of peace of their own free will, then the President of the United States, and I think justifiably, should have said, and I think his hands would have been upheld had he said: "We will now sit here; if you desire, we will counsel with you when you undertake to arrange the much more complex conditions existing between you and the German Empire. We have been your associates in this fight. We have fought to prevent future wars. We have fought for the United States of America, and its fight. Now, we are perfectly willing to be enrolled among those who will use every effort consistent with national sovereignty and integrity and American patriotism to assist you in preserving peace, not only for the next 10 years or the next 40 years, but for the next 100 years, or for unknown or untold centuries. We will sit here, if you so desire. We have settled our personal matters, those of particular interest to the people of the United States. We are back on a peace basis, except that this treaty has not yet been ratified. Pending its ratification, pending its consideration, pending my return to the United States carrying it with me as a completed document, I will sit here and counsel with you, with this statement—that if you can arrive at a treaty between yourselves any portion of which tending toward keeping the peace of the world in the future I can support, I will underwrite that treaty for you or that portion of that treaty."

You have been asking what I thought should have been the process of the negotiations, what I thought should have been the conduct of the President of the United States, with due deference to the great position which he holds, I say that these are my sentiments, and what I should have done.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think that if the President of the United States were merely an advisor, a sort of an amicus curiae, as I understand the position of the Senator, in the negotiations, then after the treaty of peace had been made between the allied Governments and the Central Powers, if this Government had underwritten it he would have subjected himself to a storm of criticism—

Mr. FALL. Oh, Mr. President—

Mr. KING. Let me complete the question.

Mr. FALL. But the Senator assumes to put me in a position which I do not occupy.

Mr. KING. As I understood the Senator, and I am, of course, placing the interpretation upon the Senator's remarks that seemed to me to be obvious. Assuming that my interpretation is correct, does not the Senator think that would have been an entangling alliance against which he and other Senators are now inveighing?

Mr. FALL. What are you in now?

Mr. KING. I will wait until the treaty is signed, and then I shall be very happy to tell the Senator.

Mr. FALL. You saw a tentative draft of the proposed league of nations. What does the Senator call that? I did not propose the league of nations. I stated distinctly, and I reiterate it now for the benefit of the Senator, that looking on during the negotiations for peace, if I, in my judgment, believed that those negotiations had resulted in such a state of affairs that under the terms of the treaty peace could be kept, that it would conduce to peace, in so far as the terms relating to peace or conducting to peace hereafter were concerned, I would have ratified it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate resolution No. 12.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I had not intended to enter upon this line of discussion. It was brought out, as the Senators know is so often the case, by first one suggestion and then another. I shall consider, with the permission of the Senate, at some early date in the future some portions of this treaty and state some of my particular objections to it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN obtained the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will permit me, everyone seems to be in favor of the resolution submitted by my colleague. Can we not have unanimous consent to refer it to the committee? Then if Senators want to do so they can continue to debate it.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask to which resolution the Senator refers?

Mr. NORRIS. The resolution of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

Mr. THOMAS. The resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is now the unfinished business before the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand, but it will take only a moment to get unanimous consent that this resolution of investigation be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Nebraska for that purpose?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am perfectly willing to do so if it is understood that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is interested in this resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. He is not opposed to it; he is in favor of it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I thought he might want to discuss it.

Mr. NORRIS. He can discuss it at any time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not know whether he will want to discuss it when it is away from the Senate or not. I think I shall object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made and the resolution goes to the calendar.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I may be wrong about the position of the Senator from Idaho, but I know he was waiting here and expected to discuss the matter.

Mr. NORRIS. He can discuss it when it comes back from the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand that, but he may want to discuss it now in view of the remarks of the Senator

from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. Let it lie on the table until the Senator from Idaho returns to the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. May I suggest to the Senator from Washington that the discussion for the last hour has been on the resolution which the Presiding Officer has just laid before the Senate anyway? The Senator from Idaho will have ample opportunity in which to present his views and to answer the senior Senator from Nebraska, so I trust the Senator will make no objection to the request for unanimous consent to refer the resolution to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It may only delay the reference of it until the Senator from Idaho comes into the Chamber. Then, if he does not want to discuss it at that time, it can go to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. NORRIS. My request was that the resolution introduced for the investigation by my colleague be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, where it has to go under the rule before we can pass it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that objection was made.

Mr. NORRIS. I so understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution then goes to the calendar.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me for a moment?

Mr. KENYON. I was just going to ask a question with the permission of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. I would like to ask the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], whose resolution is now before the Senate and the unfinished business, when he expects to get a vote on it? There are some very important bills on the calendar, which we would like to have brought up, and this stands in the way of any other business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I hesitate to state when I expect to get a vote on it, but I will answer the Senator from Iowa by saying that I am going to endeavor to get a vote upon it and shall continue in that endeavor every time the matter is laid before the Senate until a vote is obtained. I trust it may be within the next hour or so. If not, I hope within the next day or so, and if not then, within the next week or so, but at any rate I am going to continue it as the unfinished business until it comes to an issue and we learn exactly what our rights are or whether we have any rights at all.

Mr. KENYON. Then I hope the Senator will not lay the resolution aside for anything that may come along, but let us get rid of it and go on with some other business that does not require so much time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I quite agree with the Senator, and I shall not consent to lay it aside again.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution we were discussing before 2 o'clock be laid on the table without prejudice.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is satisfactory to me, unless we can have it referred.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] thinks the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] may want to speak upon it, and he does not wish to have it referred until the Senator from Idaho says whether he wants to speak upon it or not. This will not delay it long. Unanimous consent can be asked later in the day that it be referred to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah asks that the resolution lie on the table, going over without objection. Is there objection?

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to ask the Senator from California if he will not consent to temporarily lay aside the unfinished business, so that I may call up the Indian appropriation bill? It is very important that that bill should be acted on speedily. I thought the order had been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to know first if there is any objection to the request of the Senator from Utah. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. By unanimous consent, that will be the order.

Mr. CURTIS. I now renew my request of the Senator from California. It is important that the Indian appropriation bill shall be passed before July 1. In some of the departments they are already issuing furloughs to clerks because they have not money to pay them for this month. That being true, I would like to get the Indian appropriation bill through this afternoon. I do not think it will take over an hour or an hour and a half. If it should take a longer time, then I would very gladly consent to laying it aside.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I regret exceedingly that I can not comply with the request of the Senator from Kansas. I would be delighted to do so, but so much time has been occupied with what seemed to me a simple proposition that I want to bring it to a conclusion at the earliest possible moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. CURTIS. I give notice that I am going to stay here and do my best toward calling up the Indian appropriation bill. Tomorrow morning, if it is not called up to-day, I shall call it up at the conclusion of the morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business, Senate resolution No. 12, is before the Senate and the pending question is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, on which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BORAH subsequently said: I understand that during my absence from the Chamber the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] went over upon the supposition that I might desire to debate it and therefore it was not permitted to be referred. I wish to say that if the Senator from Nebraska will ask unanimous consent, which will not interfere with the pending order, that it go to the committee, whatever I have to say upon it I can say while it is in the committee just as well as while it is here. If the Senator will ask permission that it be considered now, I will not object.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution introduced by me last night be now referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I want to say a few words briefly in support of the resolution offered by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. I do not propose to make any extended remarks. I think this issue has been clearly debated by the Senate, probably at too great length, and I noticed this morning that the discussion of the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] drifted into the question as to why the Senate was not furnished with a copy of the treaty. Some few days ago I introduced a similar resolution, requesting the Committee on Foreign Relations to transmit to the Senate an official copy of the treaty of peace. I care nothing for the form the resolution is to take. The Senate should be furnished with a copy of the treaty of peace immediately.

From my State and from every section of the country there is a demand for an authentic copy of this very important document, insistent inquiry as to why it is withheld and suggestion that continued refusal to make public the treaty necessarily implies that no reliance can be placed on the summary. Demand for publicity is made by lawyers, bankers, professional and educational men, and also by importers and manufacturers who are anxious to shape their commercial policy according to the lines of the treaty. To many of these men the summary has become an object of suspicion, and to some of actual distrust.

We have never had a war similar to this, and there was never so much interest in any public question. Anxiously the people awaited information of the treaty, and all that they received was a publication in the newspapers of what purported to be a summary. One naturally would expect a summary to be followed by the publication of that which was summarized. A sufficient time has elapsed for the receipt of the treaty. In fact, I am informed it is in the hands of the State Department. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], in his recent speech, if I understood him correctly, gave as the reason why the treaty is withheld that negotiations are still in progress, and then he volunteered the information that some changes have been made in it, information based apparently not on any word of the President or of the Department of State but derived solely from the press. If treaties can be made only with the advice and consent of the Senate, is it not strange that the Senate must look to the press for information? If our sole source of information is the press, can anyone maintain that the treaty is being made with our advice? Perhaps there are some among us who will maintain that the treaty is being made in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. To me, a layman, it seems that the treaty is being made in open defiance of all precedents. How can anyone say that the treaty is being made with the advice of the Senate when the Senate knows nothing of the negotiations except what it gleams from the press? Can it be that he who is negotiating that treaty believes that he needs no advice and spurns the provision of the Constitution which requires that

treaties must be made with the advice of the Senate? An alleged detailed summary has been published broadcast throughout the country. If it is a summary, if it is honest, if it was given forth in good faith, why is the whole document, now that it is in possession of the State Department, withheld from publication?

I should like to ask the former chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who has acted as the spokesman of the administration, this question: What is the real reason the official draft of the treaty is not forthcoming? Is there any reason why it should be withheld? And this question also: Has the former chairman been afforded an opportunity of seeing and reading the copy said to be in the State Department?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I have stated to-day that I have neither seen nor asked to see a copy of the treaty. I am confident that it would be a breach of the proprieties for me to ask the Executive or any branch of the executive department of the Government to look at a copy of a treaty that is not yet negotiated, a copy of a treaty that will not be fit to come to the Senate until it has been negotiated in accordance with the universal custom of the Government since it was established. There is not an instance the Senator can point to in the last 100 years in which the Senate has asked the Executive to send to it a copy of a treaty under negotiation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the Senator for his frank statement. He has quoted a precedent, but I will quote later in my speech the reasons why the precedent should be at this time disregarded by the President, because he himself has made a change by his messages to Congress in the very precedent and policy heretofore established.

If there is any real reason why it should be withheld, why does not the President make a plain statement to Congress and show why secret covenants secretly arrived at are indispensable. It is stated that the treaty contains a provision that when three signatories are obtained from the allied powers, the treaty becomes effective. Does this mean that if Italy, France, and England signed, they may resume commercial relations with Germany immediately, and thereby secure an advantage over the United States, unless this Senate will take the treaty on faith, and, without even reading it, consent to it? If any attention is to be paid to our commercial interests, is it not right and proper that a copy of the treaty be furnished to this Senate, so that its study may be at once commenced?

It may be that, owing to the difficulty with Italy, it was necessary to frame the treaty in this way, but, as I understand it at the present time, Italy is in agreement, and the danger that lurks in this provision may fall on the United States.

I can not understand why, if the German delegates are to be entrusted with this treaty, the United States Senate can not be trusted with it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The German delegates are no more entrusted with this treaty than the representatives of the United States are entrusted with it. The German delegates are not the treaty-ratifying body. They bear the same relation to Germany that the President of the United States and his associates on the American commission bear to our country. They are to negotiate the treaty. After they have negotiated it, after they have signed it, it will then be submitted to the ratifying body in Germany. The Senator realizes that this treaty has not been laid before the British Parliament; he realizes that it has not been laid before the Chamber of Deputies; it has not been laid before the Italian Parliament for ratification or for reading, even. It has not been laid before any ratifying body. It is exclusively and properly in the hands of those who are engaged in negotiating it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The Senator probably well knows there is no parliamentary body except this one that has the ratifying power. I do not know the source of his information, and I venture to say that a copy of this treaty, or a correct summary of it, has been perused and scanned by the members of the parliamentary bodies of Europe.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from New Jersey is mistaken in saying that the Senate of the United States is the only body which will pass in ratification upon this treaty. It is the custom with treaties of this sort to submit them for ratification to the responsible Governments of the country. It is true there have been treaties negotiated in the past of a minor character that were not submitted to Parliament, but this treaty undoubtedly will be submitted to the House of Commons for approval.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I see nothing in the argument of the Senator from Nebraska which will convince me that the treaty should be withheld from the Senate and the people of the United States. Those of us who are to bear the responsibility to vote upon it are anxious to study it

in connection with the proposed covenant for a league of nations, and we should not be denied that right. Neither should the President longer withhold information from the American people, in view of the promise he has made to them.

It was stated here the other day that it was contrary to precedent to send to this body a treaty of peace, inasmuch as it is left to the President to negotiate the treaty, and that, therefore, it would not officially come before this body until he had presented it. The President, however, is acting as a peace delegate in this connection rather than as President. What has been the situation? In every war that we have ever had—and there never was one like this—the President has been in Washington directing the peace commissioners and conferring with the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. He remained at the White House, ready to give to the treaty his impartial opinion and, when necessary, instructing the peace commissioners and directing changes if in his judgment the draft is not in the interests of the United States. Finally he sends it to the Senate with his recommendations. The President in this connection is acting as a peace delegate, and when he returns to the United States he returns with the treaty. He comes as a peace delegate, it is true, but really as a partisan committed to the terms of peace, and the American people are denied his impartial judgment and opinion as their President.

The only coordinate branch of government which can give the American people an impartial consideration of this treaty, inasmuch as they have been deprived of the impartial judgment of the President, is the Senate. It is therefore desirable that the President should immediately release the text of the treaty of peace in order that we may have sufficient time to consider the terms and give to the peace delegation at Versailles, as representatives of the people of this country, our suggestions.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like to know the attitude of the Senator from New Jersey. Assuming that the President either wisely or unwisely has agreed with the other delegates to the peace conference not to give it out, what would the Senator say to that?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will come to that later, because I will state to the Senator from Montana that it is in open defiance of the President's promise to the American people that he would have no secret covenant secretly arrived at.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Would the Senator have him break his promise to the other representatives?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would have him revise it and say the time has come when the American people should have the information, as I promised them on January 8, 1918, they would have.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Permit me to remind the Senator the resolution is not to ask the President to revise his promise, but to break his promise, assuming that it has been given.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator, in connection with the question asked by the Senator from Montana, if the President has promised the other Governments that he will not give publicity to the treaty, then has he not already violated that agreement in giving a summary, assuming the summary to be correct?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. Is not that just as bad, if that is a correct summary, as to give us the treaty itself?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am very glad the Senator has asked that question. I think everyone naturally assumes, and it is a very reasonable assumption in view of everything we know and have heard about this matter, that the representatives at the peace conference agreed among themselves not to give out the full text of the treaty, but to give out only a summary thereof, and that summary has been given out in strict accordance with the agreement, presumably.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator assume that the summary is correct and that it is a summary of the entire treaty?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator from Montana assumes that the summary was given out by and under the direction of the delegates at the peace conference.

Mr. NORRIS. But the Senator has not answered my question.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I assume that it is a reasonably accurate summary.

Mr. NORRIS. Assume that it is not only reasonably accurate, but that it is accurate. It seems to me we ought to have no assumption if that summary has come from the President.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. How can I assume it?

Mr. NORRIS. Then what is the difference between giving that summary publicity and making the whole treaty public and letting everyone draw his own conclusion as to what it is?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is another question altogether. That is a question that should be addressed to the wisdom of the conference at Paris. They agreed among themselves, I assume, not to give out the full treaty, but to give out a summary which, I assume, they approved.

Mr. NORRIS. Again, the Senator has not answered the question. What is the difference between the two, as far as publicity is concerned, if this summary is correct? What more harm could come from giving out all the treaty and letting everybody draw his own conclusion as to what it might mean than giving out somebody's conclusion as to what the treaty means?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not know that there is the slightest difference, but I am directing my mind to what they did over there. They reached the conclusion that it would be prudent and wise to give out a summary and that it would be imprudent and unwise to give out the full treaty. They may have erred, they may have reached a very senseless conclusion, but I want the Senator to assume that the President of the United States, either upon his own motion or being constrained to that course by the views of the others, agreed that the whole treaty should not be given out.

Mr. NORRIS. Assuming that to be true, we have not any official knowledge of it. The reply to this resolution, if those are the facts, would give an official statement in substance the same as the Senator from Montana has given, and that would be an answer; that is, I take it—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But it would be quite appropriate.

Mr. NORRIS. While it would convince me that it was a very unwise thing to do, as the Senator said, he might conclude it was a foolish thing to do, it would at least be a proper answer to the resolution, and, I presume, would end the controversy.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But would it not be equally appropriate for the Senate to find out what the facts are before it demands the production of the treaty?

Mr. NORRIS. That is the way to find out. I do not believe there would be any difference in passing a resolution that would ask the President whether he has made this kind of an agreement. Would it not be just the same thing, in effect, as to pass this resolution and ask him to send the treaty to us?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am very glad, indeed, the Senator from Nebraska takes the view that if the President did enter into such an agreement, either willingly or being constrained to do so by reason of the views of the other delegates there, we ought not to ask him to break his agreement.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I would not, and if the President makes that answer, no matter how great a mistake I might think he had made, if he says officially that those are the facts, then it is finished; I will have to abide by it, and I would abide by it. It seems to me this resolution is the way to reach it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have no quarrel with the Senator from Nebraska, only I think the right way is to ascertain the facts beforehand.

Mr. NORRIS. How can that be done?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The State Department will tell you. The Committee on Foreign Relations is to ascertain what the fact is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has the floor, and he will proceed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] that I would far rather have the President keep his promises to the American people and revise his promise to the peace delegates than to break his promise to the American people.

Mr. WALSH of Montana and Mr. McCORMICK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator from Montana, in view of the fact I made the statement just now.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I quite agree with the Senator. I am wholly in accord with his desire that if the President made such a promise I should like to ask him to revise it; but I have not the slightest doubt that before he made it he had in mind his promise to the American people. I have no doubt in the world if he could have his own way this treaty would be placed in the form in which it is now, even if it is incomplete, before the American people. We all understand that at the outset he was desirous of giving to this proceeding a greater degree of publicity than was given to it, but he was overruled by representatives of France, Italy, and Japan, if we can rely upon—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Where does the Senator—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Wait a minute. I am coming to this point. I apprehend very likely that if the President was asked to revise his promise he would say he had reflected upon the matter with the other gentlemen associated with him. If that were true, what would the Senator from New Jersey do? Would he still demand the treaty?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I most certainly should demand that the President keep his pledge made to the American people January 8, 1918. I yield now to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I venture to suggest to the Senator from Montana that, if this entirely respectful resolution were passed, it would fortify the President in suggesting to his colleagues that the American people still cherish some faint faith in the pledge that we would have "open covenants openly arrived at," and would help him to persuade his colleagues that he ought to abide by his pledge therein implied.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. May I ask a question, with the indulgence of the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I desire to say that I do not agree with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] that this is an entirely respectful resolution. Attention has already been called in the Senate to the fact that it is not in the form of the respectful resolutions which have usually been addressed to the President with reference to such matters.

In that connection, reference was made this morning to a late discussion on this general subject by Senator Sutherland, formerly a Member of this body, who states in the very same connection that the only appropriate way to draft a resolution in relation to matters of this character is to ask the President respectfully, if the matter is not inconsistent with public policy, to transmit the documents that are requested.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I care nothing for the verbiage of this resolution. I hope it is in plain terms calling for a copy of this treaty. I think the time has come to speak plainly, and I will not—

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No; I will not yield until I finish, and then I shall be very glad to answer any question. I am going to conclude what I have to say in a few moments. I have been interrupted so often that I have spoken longer than I intended.

The only coordinate branch of government which can give the American people an impartial consideration of this treaty, inasmuch as they have been deprived of the impartial judgment of the President, he being committed at the peace table, is the Senate of the United States. It is therefore desirable that the President should immediately release the text of the treaty of peace in order that we may have sufficient time to consider the terms and give to the peace delegation at Versailles, as representatives of the people of this country, our suggestions on these great questions.

On January 8, 1918, the President of the United States came before Congress and delivered this message:

It will be our wish and purpose that the processes of peace, when they are begun, shall be absolutely open and that they shall involve and permit henceforth no secret understandings of any kind. The day of conquest and aggrandizement is gone by; so is also the day of secret covenants entered into in the interest of particular governments and likely at some unlooked-for moment to upset the peace of the world. It is this happy fact, now clear to the view of every public man whose thoughts do not still linger in an age that is dead and gone, which makes it possible for every nation whose purposes are consistent with justice and the peace of the world to avow now or at any other time the objects it has in view.

Then followed the famous 14 points, the first one of which is:

I. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

When the President of the United States appeared before Congress on December 2, 1918, he stated his intention of departing immediately for Europe. He gave his reasons and made this pledge to the American people and to this body:

I shall be in close touch with you and with affairs on this side of the water and you will know all that I do. At my request the French and English Governments have absolutely removed the censorship of cable news, which until within a fortnight they had maintained, and there is now no censorship whatever exercised at this end, except upon attempted trade communications with enemy countries. * * * I did so at the advice of the most experienced cable officials, and I hope that the results will justify my hopes that the news of the next few months may pass with utmost freedom and with the least possible delay from each side of the ocean to the other.

I trusted the President of the United States, as did the American people. The American people are patient, they are long-suffering, but the time will come when they will resent vigorously the secrecy of these negotiations. No sufficient rea-

son has been given why the doctrine of open covenants openly arrived at, so frequently proclaimed as an essential, has not been practiced. "You can fool some of the people all of the time, you can fool all of the people some of the time, but you can not fool all of the people all of the time." The President of the United States is responsible to the people of this country, and it is his duty to keep the pledge he has made. It is plainly his duty to tell what he is doing, and as he appears unwilling to do so it is our duty to remind him of his promise, and that is the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, at the outset I wish to express my regret to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that I interrupted him this morning at a time when my interruption seemed to be an annoyance.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I trust the Senator will allow me to say that his interruptions are never to me an annoyance, and I hope I am incapable of being in any way rude to him. I did not intend to be. All I meant to say was, and I think what I did say was, that I was coming to that point in my own poor way if he would give me time. I certainly did not intend to be otherwise than courteous to the Senator from Colorado. I always welcome interruptions from him.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the fact that the Senator from Massachusetts is always courteous, not only to myself but to all of his associates, is what prompted me at this time to express regret that I had asked a question at a time when possibly I might have interfered with his general current of thought.

I did not intend further to delay the progress of this resolution to a final vote until the little colloquy of day before yesterday projected a new feature into the controversy and which formed, and very properly formed, the basis of the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. I am glad, Mr. President, that the Senator from Nebraska prepared and introduced his resolution so promptly, and I know that it would have been even more promptly introduced had he been here at the time the colloquy took place.

Mr. President, the situation, so far as I am able to comprehend it, may be thus summarized: Early in May the peace congress at Paris concluded tentatively its labors. Immediately thereafter, for reasons doubtless of a convincing character to them, the members of that congress agreed inter se to postpone the publication of the treaty, but gave to the world a synopsis of the treaty which purported, at least, to convey an intelligent idea of its contents. At the same time a complete copy of the proposed agreement was forwarded to the office of the Secretary of State at Washington, and it has been there ever since.

Copies of this treaty were, as a matter of course and of necessity, furnished to the representatives of the German Government or of the German people, who doubtless received them subject to the same injunction, but, characteristically, the treaty was published in Germany without regard to the condition.

About this time the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] prepared and introduced his resolution instructing the Secretary of State to transmit to this body a complete copy of the proposed treaty. Pending that resolution, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] was shown by a friend of his in the city of New York what purported to be a complete copy of the treaty, accompanied by the information that at least four such copies were in the hands of private parties in that city.

At the same time the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] made this announcement on day before yesterday on this floor, which is found on page 558 of the Record:

That the treaty is now in the possession of certain interests in New York City. While the Senate of the United States is asking for a treaty with which it will ultimately have to deal, and while the American people are asking for a treaty by which they will ultimately, in all probability, be bound, and are unable to secure it, certain interests in the city of New York are in the possession of this treaty and are discussing it.

It was after and doubtless because of that statement that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] gave to the Senate the information which he had upon the subject. In a colloquy which immediately followed between the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts the following statements were made:

Mr. LODGE. * * * The copies of the treaty were given out that I have referred to, and they found that many of them were going to America, and an order was issued from our headquarters in Paris that no more were to be permitted.

Mr. SWANSON. By whom were they given out?

Mr. LODGE. Given out by the authorities.

Mr. SWANSON. What authorities?

Mr. LODGE. The representatives of the United States.

Mr. SWANSON. What representatives?

Mr. LODGE. I suppose some of the President's followers. I do not suppose he gave them out himself.

Mr. SWANSON. What followers? They are not representatives. I have understood they do not represent the United States.

Mr. LODGE. There are no representatives over there except the President's personal agents.

Mr. SWANSON. There is nobody authorized to give out foreign affairs under the Constitution except the President of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. Very well, then, they were given out by his order.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the Senator make that statement on his own responsibility?

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not know whether he ordered it or not.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the Senator know where they came from?

Mr. LODGE. They came from Paris. They were given out by our representatives there.

Mr. President, I think it is a necessary conclusion from this discussion that the Senator from Massachusetts not only saw one of these copies but received information at the same time justifying his statement that they were given out by representatives of the United States in Paris. I was astounded at that declaration, and felt that it should be considered at some time in the future, in view of the serious nature of the assertion, because if it be true that by an agreement between the Nations, including our own, none of these copies was to be made public; and if it be also true that pending this agreement, and while it was in full force, some representative or representatives of the Government did transmit these copies to New York, those representatives should be identified and disciplined in the absence of some cogent explanation justifying their extraordinary action. I think, therefore, that this resolution is not only desirable, but absolutely necessary, for if, in addition to what I have said, it be also true—and I have no doubt that the Senator from Idaho believed it to be true when he made the statement—that certain interests in New York, deeply concerned in the terms and in the ratification or rejection of the treaty, had been favored with these copies in advance of information given to the American people, then there has not only been a breach of the agreement but a betrayal, in so far as information of the contents of the treaty may be concerned, of the interests and possibly of the well-being of the United States.

We know that there are great interests in this country centering in the city of New York, with which presumably up to this time the Senator from Idaho is not on familiar terms, but to which he further made reference in a subsequent part of the discussion by the statement:

I want the President to know that those people in New York who have these copies are using it in a semipublic way, to wit, in a way which will inform all those who are interested with them as to its contents, and I shall not assume until the facts have shown the contrary that when that fact is brought to the attention of the President he will withhold from the people that which those who are particularly interested in the treaty have in their possession.

This conclusion, Mr. President, is a correct one, for, if it be true that certain specific parties of powerful industrial, economic, and commercial standing in the United States have, in spite of this agreement, been able to forearm themselves with copies of the treaty, then it is equally true that they have some sinister, or at least some private, purpose in view as contradistinguished from the public interest; and it is not only the right but the duty under those circumstances of the President of the United States at once to take the public into his confidence and see to it that the full text of the treaty is immediately published. I do not pretend to know anything about the matter beyond the statements which were made by the two distinguished Senators who made the statements to which I have called attention.

I have refrained, Mr. President, from discussing the treaty for a number of reasons which seemed to me, at least, to be controlling. In the first place, I do not know what the treaty is, and can not know until the Executive sees fit in some manner to inform the Senate of its contents. I do not believe that we can safely discuss it in advance of full knowledge of its terms, and I am not at all convinced that its discussion in this body in advance of its transmission will be helpful to the treaty-making powers across the sea.

Moreover, Mr. President, I entertain, and have always entertained, the conviction that we have no jurisdiction over this treaty, and can have no jurisdiction over it until the Executive sees fit in the usual course to submit it to our consideration. I have heretofore discussed my understanding of that provision of the treaty-making power which clothes the Senate with an authority which must be jointly exercised with that of the Executive. I shall not attempt at this time to review what I have said on that subject, but I do not think that I overstate the proposition when I say that, with two or three exceptions, among whom Mr. Madison and the late Senator Bacon may, perhaps, be considered the most conspicuous, the overwhelming judgment and opinion of the great lawyers and statesmen of the past and of the present has been that the President may consult the Senate or decline to consult the Senate in advance of the signing of a treaty and its transmission to this body

by the Executive; that in almost all instances he has deemed it expedient to submit the treaty to us after it has been completed by negotiation, and it is only when he takes the initiative, either prior to the negotiation of the treaty or afterwards, that our part of the treaty-making power comes into play. While we may be concerned, and deeply concerned, regarding the covenants of any proposed treaty subject to negotiation; while we have a right, of course, following the dictates of our individual consciences, to discuss it in advance of its reception, I think the proposition I have stated is unchallengeable.

The Senator from Massachusetts, who complained this morning that he had been so frequently quoted, always took that ground prior to the inauguration of the present President of the United States, and, if I remember correctly, he always advocated cloture prior to that time, but has been one of the champions in opposition to the proposition since. The Senator is a man of great versatility; but if it be true that consistency is the vice of little minds, it is equally true that the Senator is entirely free from that vice; and if I were uncharitably disposed I might emphasize the fact that upon the great question of the league of nations the Senator has been equally emphatic in his advocacy of and his dissent from the virtue or the expediency of that great proposition.

Now, Mr. President, a word or two with regard to the pending resolution and I will yield the floor. I may do the Senator from Massachusetts a grave injustice—and if so, I am very sorry—but I can not relieve my mind from the suspicion that on any other occasion than this he would use his great knowledge and his great powers of argument in vindication of the right and jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations to take charge of and investigate the matter before the final investigation by the Senate. It is true that many resolutions comparatively unimportant have by unanimous consent been immediately considered which, if referred, would have gone to that committee, but this is not an unimportant resolution. I am sure that the author of it, at least, does not so regard it, notwithstanding the fact that it is couched in terms entirely at variance with all of the precedents of the past.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Does the Senator know of any instance in which there has been material difference of opinion amongst Senators as to any statement of fact involved in a resolution when that resolution has not been referred to a committee for inquiry and report?

Mr. THOMAS. No, Mr. President; I do not. I think I so stated when I had the floor upon another occasion in the discussion of this particular subject.

Mr. President, I wish I could dismiss from my mind the impression that this resolution is more of a political resolution than anything else; that it is one of the various movements, now so common and with which we shall become more familiar as time shall pass, leading up to the great presidential campaign of 1920 and designed as material for that campaign. Of that I am not complaining; human nature is human nature, whether we find it on the other side or on this side of the Chamber, and the play of politics, to use a common expression, is one which has its experts on this side as well as upon the other side of the Chamber. I have come to this conclusion by listening to and reading the discussions upon the other side of the Chamber of this particular resolution. It seems to me that they are composed, generally speaking, of 99 per cent of politics and reflections upon the President of the United States and 1 per cent of genuine argument.

Mr. President, it may be that the result of a policy like this will be beneficial to those who are responsible for it. As to that, however, I am also somewhat doubtful. We all know that since the death of Mr. Roosevelt—whose demise has been publicly mourned and privately rejoiced over—many candidates for the Presidency of the United States have blossomed, and will continue to blossom, on the other side of this Chamber; and each, of course, is plowing his own furrow with his own heifer, in the hope that his plowshare will turn up the particular presidential grub. I hate to say anything that will put a damper upon the aspirations of my brethren upon the other side, for all of whom I entertain the highest personal opinion; yet I must remind them that never in the history of the United States has a Senator been nominated and elected to the Presidency; and from some of the performances that I have seen in this body since I have been here, on both sides, I have long ago ceased to wonder at what once addressed itself to my mind as a most remarkable phenomenon. So, while we may sow, there is every probability that those on the outside will reap, if there should be a harvest at all.

I have always regretted the intrusion of the personal factor into the consideration of any international question, unless, indeed, circumstances exist of the most irrefragable character reflecting upon the motives or the intentions of those conducting the negotiations. Some one has said that vituperation is not argument, but a mere form of self-indulgence; and I have never known a man to enter into it very largely who did not both weaken the force of his argument and justify suspicion of his sincerity. Now, it is very difficult for many people—good people, too; well-meaning people and sincere people—to discuss the league of nations, which is the most prominent feature of the proposed treaty, either as advocates for or opponents of that measure, without impugning the motives, ridiculing the arguments, or aspersing the mental integrity of their opponents; and that, Mr. President, if it is continued in, is just as sure as anything can be to drive the consideration of this great treaty into the arena of party politics, and thereby either largely imperil its success or contribute to its defeat.

I say this, Mr. President, not as an advocate of the treaty, because I do not know whether I shall vote for it or not, and I do not propose to commit myself until I have thoroughly familiarized myself, or become as familiar as I can, with all of its various specifications and covenants. I am not an enthusiast over a league of nations. I certainly have not been well disposed toward some of the articles of the original draft. I am not entirely sure that the amendments which have been offered are sufficiently comprehensive to remove my objections. But, Mr. President, I have no more doubt of the earnestness and the patriotism and the sincerity of those who believe in this league of nations, as it is drawn or otherwise, I have no more doubt that they are inspired by the highest motives of patriotism and sense of duty than I have that I try to be guided by the same lofty principles and sentiments in my consideration of it.

The President of the United States has for a long time borne the greatest burden ever placed by fate and the circumstances of the times upon the shoulders of a human being. He has carried the weight of the world upon himself and has been compelled to act not only as the advocate but as the arbiter of the mightiest problems that ever confronted a peace congress or any other congregation of men since civilization began. That he has made mistakes goes without saying; that he may have made blunders is equally probable; but that he has been actuated by a high sense of duty, a love of country, and with a full realization of his great responsibilities and their consequences I make no more doubt than I would presume to express the same doubt with regard to the responsibilities and performances of the martyred President. Whether or not I agree with the President finally in the vote which my duties require me to cast in this body, I here and now pay tribute to his intelligence, to his wisdom, to his patriotism, and to his statesmanship.

I sometimes think, Mr. President, that men can not forgive Mr. Wilson for the part he has been compelled to play, and has played so well, in the greatest crisis that has ever confronted the world of mankind, and that his fault in their eyes is that fate so arranged the destinies of America as to have laid its heavy hand upon the Republic during his administration; and I am reminded by the history of my country that every Executive compelled to meet, because confronted with, extraordinary conditions and responsibilities had to undergo the same ordeal and walk through the same valley of misunderstanding and vituperation, only to receive, when too late for him to appreciate it, the grateful plaudits of an admiring posterity.

Mr. President, a friend of mine a day or two ago handed me this clipping, which I will read. It is entitled "A Voice From the Past"; and then follows this quotation:

The President succeeded on this occasion because he acted without sense and without constraint in a panorama that was gotten up more for the benefit of his party than for the glory of the Nation and the honor of the dead. * * * We pass over the silly remarks of the President; for the credit of the Nation we are willing that the veil of oblivion shall be dropped over them and that they shall no more be repeated or thought of.

Then follows the comment:

This is not an extract from an editorial in the New York Sun or the New York Tribune. Nor were the sentiments quoted above taken from any of the public utterances of Senator POINDEXTER or Senator SHERMAN or Senator MCCORMICK. They are from an editorial that was printed in the Harrisburg Patriot and Union on November 24, 1863, and have no reference to Woodrow Wilson.

The President in question was Abraham Lincoln. The "silly remarks" were the Gettysburg speech.

So, Mr. President, in time to come, some may be remembered, if remembered at all, only because of their abuse and misunderstanding, their vituperation and derogation, of the President of the United States. I do not wish to be understood in what I have just said as in the slightest degree reflecting upon the purpose or the sincerity of the author of this resolution; but I

do say that when a resolution like this comes—which should be addressed to the President, instead of which it is addressed to the Secretary of State, which should be conditioned upon compatibility with the public interest, and that condition is absent, and which is sought to be forced through this body without reference to the appropriate channels—it justifies a criticism of the course pursued.

I do not myself see the present importance of the motion, if it be true that publicity has already been given to this treaty, and in any event I am willing to agree with my associates upon a time to vote upon it. I have no desire to take up the time of the Senate or of the country, to postpone or delay the consideration of important appropriation bills by an interminable discussion of a resolution that ought to come to a vote.

I hope, therefore, that before long the Senator will suggest the possibility of a unanimous-consent agreement under which we can dispose of the question one way or the other, get it behind us, as we have finally gotten the suffrage amendment behind us, and take up these more important, practical, and immediate measures.

Mr. BORAH obtained the floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator from North Dakota wish to discuss the pending resolution?

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to say just a word on this resolution.

Mr. BORAH. The one we are now considering?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Very well; I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, in this great world crisis, when the greatest burdens that were ever imposed upon public men are now being carried on the shoulders of delegates assembled in Paris, I feel that I should be worse than wasting my time if I spent a single moment in attempting to put the President in a hole by holding up his declarations for "open covenants openly arrived at" on the one hand and his acts of secret covenants secretly arrived at on the other hand.

I do not agree with his declaration at all in international relations. There never has been a time in the history of the United States when every international question was not considered by the Senate behind closed doors; and even at our legislative sessions we have often, when we considered that we were trenching upon ground which might create international ill feeling, immediately voted to close the doors and to consider the matter in secret.

As between two families in which there is a proposal for marital relations, each family may consider from its own standpoint the advisability of the proposed union. Now, if it were possible that each must publish what was said in the family circle concerning the family of the other, there would be eternal enmity between those two families. So in the family of nations, in order that we may secure a fair and just consideration of every matter without at the same time affecting the other country in a way that would make that country our enemy for all time, we have found it necessary—and every other nation in the world has followed the same course—to consider those delicate international questions behind closed doors.

Mr. President, the President of the United States, in his declarations that appeal possibly to the ear but do not appeal to the judgment in the practical affairs of life, has seen fit to use the phrase that is so often quoted before the Senate of the United States. Not agreeing with him upon that, I think he has found that it is not applicable in considering the thousands of complex and delicate questions that are arising in that distracted country to-day, and among people upon whose lips is still the froth of battle and in whose hearts is still the hate of conflict; that it is not wise that all that is said and done should be openly said and done before the entire world. So, if he entered into an agreement with the other nations of the world, or if he opposed it, and the other great nations—our Allies—forced the matter to be considered behind closed doors, I think that they used the better judgment; and I would not for a moment infringe upon their right to first bring before us a completed treaty, signed and negotiated, before we had anything to do with it.

But, Mr. President, a little different situation is presented to-day. A portion of this treaty has already been published. It is asserted, and asserted in such a way that I can not doubt its authenticity, that complete copies of the treaty have fallen into the hands of certain Americans and American interests, and possibly into the public forums of some of the other countries of the world. That presents a little different aspect of the case. Now, I am not in favor of voting for this resolution exactly in the form that it is. I believe that it should have

been addressed to the President of the United States and not to the Secretary of State. But that is merely a matter of form, because the Secretary of State will act only upon the advice and with the consent of the President of the United States. I do think, however, that we ought to follow one precedent that has been a precedent from the very beginning of the intercourse between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government, and that is, in asking for any matter in which the executive department has in the first instance the entire and complete jurisdiction, it is but proper that we ask that department to give us the facts "if not incompatible with public interest."

Now, what objection can there be to that? I will ask the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] if he would have any objection to so amending his resolution that there shall be added after the word "requested," on line 2, the words "if not incompatible with public interest"?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, in response to the Senator's query, I will say that I have no objection to the addition of such a matter, and I will explain, if desired, the reasons why the resolution is addressed to the Secretary of State.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is entitled to explain, and I yield for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Senator has well remarked that the particular proposition that is presented here is a vastly different proposition from that presented by the ordinary diplomatic procedure, or that which comes to us during the ordinary proceedings when treaties are considered. As he says, there has been given to the people a synopsis of the treaty. That synopsis has been printed by the official authority of the Secretary of State. In the possession of the Secretary of State is the completed document, as we understand, and therefore, a document having been given out by the Secretary of State that presumably gave a synopsis of the particular treaty, to the entire information the Congress and the people are entitled. I shall be very glad, if the Senator deems it essential, to amend the resolution in the respect that he suggests by adding "if not incompatible with the public welfare."

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I can see no impropriety in the world in asking the President of the United States or the Secretary of State to give us this information, if not incompatible with public interest; and I can see no impropriety or inconsistency, if the facts justify it, in the President's saying that it has been agreed between the nations of the world that entire publicity shall not be given until the instrument has been completed. That would be a sufficient answer to the American people, in my opinion, and would be a full justification, for certainly if there has been an agreement that all of the facts which are being considered shall not be given publicity until they arrive at an arrangement, then the President can well say, "It is against the public interest for me to break the word of the representatives of the United States that this shall be our course of conduct."

So, Mr. President, I can see no reason on earth why we can not properly ask the President for this information through the Secretary of State, coupling with it the courteous phrase which we have always used, "if not incompatible with public interest." Then if the President thinks the facts warrant the statement, notwithstanding the fact that some portions have been made public in the shape of a synopsis and that some portions have surreptitiously escaped from the control of the delegation, he will fairly and honestly say to the American people that he does not think it compatible with public interest—and he might say, with national honor—to disclose to the public at present all of the terms of the proposed treaty.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I agree with very much that the Senator has said about the delicacy of international treaties, where each nation wants to secure the fullest possible advantages for its own country without giving the negotiations to the world; but there is one suggestion I should like to make to the Senator that has been troubling me somewhat.

This is a confessedly unfinished treaty, subject this minute to amendment of any item in it by the commissioners having it now under charge. What advantage can it be to the Senate to have it at present? What use have you or I or any other Senator for an unfinished, still amendable, and still being amended treaty; and what is our purpose in wanting it, if we are in fact earnestly engaged in an effort to carry the treaty to a final vote in the Senate? I can not see the purpose in wanting it.

Mr. McCUMBER. There can not be so very much more in these supposed treaties that are in the hands of certain financial or other interests in New York than that which is contained in

the synopsis; and I am rather inclined to think that at least under all the conditions the American people have a right to know whether or not there is anything so diametrically opposed to what has been given out in the synopsis as to justify any such apprehensions as have been created by the mere verbal statements and hints.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. But the knowledge of the fact to which the Senator refers came out subsequently to the introduction of this resolution. I am only wondering why we want an unfinished treaty that the President does not himself willingly give out?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not know, Mr. President. I want the President to express an opinion whether or not he wishes willingly to give it out. I do not want the President to be charged with attempting to hold this matter in secret of his own accord when, as a matter of fact, he would like to give it out. I would be perfectly willing to present the matter to him and ask him to give us the facts if not incompatible with the public interest, and his judgment will determine whether or not it would be so incompatible.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. There is great force in what the Senator says, and it is appealing. The thing itself has justified at this time this particular course. If this had gone to the committee, it seems to me, the very argument the Senator makes here might have led us long ago to pass this resolution, and I think we could have done it. I think the Senator's appeal is one that would strike a reasonable man; and if there is any necessity for this action at all, which I still can not see, it strikes me how easily the course would have been, as applied to the Hitchcock resolution, to have it go to the committee for its consideration and report to the Senate in the usual way. Suspicion attaches to it, perhaps, that it is desired to avoid the committee's investigation.

Mr. McCUMBER. As I said before, if I thought this was being done in any way to gain some kind of a partisan or political advantage, I would never vote for it, because I think that in this particular season in the world's history we ought to lay aside our partisanship. I must assume that it is in the best of faith that we may secure for the benefit of the American people all that has been given to the world and nothing more, and if the President feels, as I have an opinion that he will feel undoubtedly, that he can not with justice to us or his colleagues give out this information, all he has to do is to say so.

Mr. President, I move to amend the resolution by inserting—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is not in order at this time. There is a motion before the Senate, and the amendment is not in order, unless the original mover of the resolution accepts it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I accept the amendment, which I understand it is to add "if not incompatible with public interest."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed modification will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "requested," in line 2, insert "if not incompatible with the public interest."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This modification of the original resolution will be made.

Mr. KELLOGG obtained the floor.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. KELLOGG. If it is only for a question.

Mr. EDGE. I wish to ask a question of the Senator who offered the amendment. I have no particular objection to the amendment, but I did not have the opportunity of hearing his entire argument, having been called from the Chamber. On what particular line of reasoning does he assume it is necessary to insert the words "if not incompatible with the public interest" when it has been so clearly established by the various arguments during the last three weeks that the public already has to a great extent the entire document? The Senator from California feels that there is no objection to including it, but if the public already has it, and it has been clearly established that they have, I can not conceive why it could possibly be incompatible with the public interest.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not know that the public has a true, authenticated copy of the treaty or that any portion of the public has a true copy of the final agreement or so far as it has progressed to-day. I explained in my argument, and I would not wish to repeat it at this time, that certainly this is the usual courteous way of addressing the President upon diplomatic questions which he has under consideration. It is his right, of course, no matter whether we use the term or not to state to us that it is not compatible with the public in-

terest for him to do so at this time, but the old custom of intercourse between the legislative and executive branches upon matters that are peculiarly within the jurisdiction of the legislative branch has been to make the request in this courteous language.

Mr. EDGE. If I may have just a moment more, with permission of the Senator from Minnesota—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield to the Senator if he will be very brief. I was going to make a few remarks on this matter myself.

Mr. EDGE. Very well, I will postpone my statement for the moment.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, ordinarily I would not take the time of the Senate to discuss this resolution, as I know there is important business pending, but it is a matter of principle, I think of great consequence to the people of this country, and I wish very briefly to state the reasons which impel me to vote for it.

I do not agree with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] with regard to consideration of treaties in secret session. I supported and voted for a rule to change the rules of the Senate so that treaties should be considered in open session. I did not mean by that that all treaties and all discussions were to be considered in open session. I meant to make that the rule, subject to exception whenever the Senate should so vote, because whenever there arises a situation where the relations of foreign countries are so delicate that the subject to be discussed may affect our interests, the doors should be closed.

I realize that it is the prerogative of the Senate and to the interest of the public that it should be done under such circumstances. But I do believe that the day of secret treaties and the day of the consideration of treaties of such vast importance in the world as this are past and that they should be considered in the open. I shall not base what I have to say upon any narrow construction of the declarations of the President in the past nor upon his declarations at all, except I would remind the Senate that they were not simply remarks made in passing during some public speech under the enthusiasm of the occasion. The principles laid down by the President as to open covenants were deliberate statements delivered in a message of the greatest importance, in which he outlined the 14 points which in his mind should form the foundation of the world peace to terminate the war, and in the list it was made the corner stone of this peace that diplomacy should be in the open, "Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed frankly and in the public view."

Not alone that, but the President has stated this time and again as the principle in which he believed. I do not say that all the conversation across the table at Versailles in the peace conference should be made public or that the meetings should be open to the entire public. I believe, however, that the great fundamental principles which the allied Governments are laying down in this treaty should be given to the world and should from time to time be made known to the people of the United States as well as to the people of other countries. They have a right to consider them. That self-determination which seems to be the corner stone of the President's theory of peace should impel him and should impel everyone in good faith to see that the people are informed as to the real terms of this treaty.

Mr. President, do we realize the tremendous importance to the world of this peace treaty? As the war involved more nations, more peoples, greater destruction and devastation, greater change in governments and overthrow of nations than has occurred in the same time since recorded history, so this peace treaty involves issues of greater moment to the people of the world than any and all the other treaties, I might say, that have ever come into existence and have gone on the tides of time.

The treaty proposes to determine the destiny of many nations and many peoples with aspirations of self-government, to divide territories, to impose punishment on the burdens of the war, and to evolve from this world chaos a peace that will be more satisfactory to the world than any prior peace, a peace that will be permanent. If it is to be a lasting peace, if it is not to be simply the cause of future wars, it must to a certain degree satisfy the aspirations of all the struggling nations of the world. Our country entered the war to protect our rights, our people, and our institutions, and to aid in developing such a peace, and we should from time to time be informed of the facts as to the activities of the peace commissioners in France.

Does the Senate remember the tremendous arraignment in the English journals of the secrecy that was observed in Paris and the injury it did in England and the other countries of Europe?

Perhaps it was necessary. I am not disposed to criticize what has been done in that regard, but the situation is different now. I might lay aside entirely the declarations of the President, and I do not discuss them with any partisan view; I might disregard all his statements and all consideration of the consequences to the people of this country and the people of the world in connection with an understanding of the terms of the treaty which are about to be imposed upon them; but there are other reasons why the Senate will not at this time encroach upon the prerogative of the President by asking for the official text of this treaty. I realize fully that the negotiation of the terms of the treaty is peculiarly the prerogative of the President. I realize that he might consult the Senate, and concerning a treaty of such great importance to his country I think it would be wise; but he must decide that.

The peace pact has been drafted after months of careful consideration by the principal statesmen of Europe, including our own commissioners. It has been delivered to the representatives of the German Government. It would seem inevitable that upon such delivery it would be made public. But beyond that let us look at it reasonably.

A synopsis of this treaty was published, and presumably it was intended that the summary should embrace an accurate description of the terms of the treaty, so that we might be informed as to the character of the treaty our commissioners were negotiating. If the synopsis was accurate the publication of the treaty can do no harm. If it is not accurate, without impugning the motive of anyone, there is every reason why we should have the treaty at the earliest possible moment. The American people have a right to express their opinion upon the settlement of these great issues.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not mean by that that we should always have our ear to the ground to catch every sound of public approval or disapproval, but I remember the statement William H. Vanderbilt once made, that everybody knows more than anybody; and the Senate of the United States can learn something from the people of this country. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. The Senator, as I understand his very clear exposition of this question, concedes that the jurisdiction of the Senate as a part of the treaty-making power does not attach until after the treaty is made. Am I right in assuming that?

Mr. KELLOGG. I concede that the Executive has the right to negotiate the terms of a treaty, but, of course, it has no binding effect until it is ratified by the coordinate branch of the Government which is a part of the treaty-making power. I concede that the President need not consult the Senate before he has formulated the treaty, if that is his judgment, although I believe he should have done it, and that practice is justified by precedent.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit another inquiry?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator has just used the word "formulated." Does the Senator contend that the treaty is now formulated in the sense that jurisdiction of the Senate attaches and that it is the duty of the President to submit it to the Senate now?

Mr. KELLOGG. Not for ratification, of course. I concede this. For five months the statesmen of the allied countries have labored in Paris to formulate a treaty which it is stated was to be presented to Germany for Germany's signature, and, as Lloyd-George said, it must be signed either in Paris or Berlin. That treaty was given to the German representatives. It has been published in Germany. Beyond that, it has been given secretly to citizens in our own country. I wish to ask the Senator if there is any citizen in this country more entitled to know its terms than a Senator of the United States, who has upon him the great responsibility of considering its terms or making suggestions as to its revision?

Mr. KING. If the Senator propounds that question for the purpose of avoiding—and I do not use that word harshly—the question which I propounded to him, and he has not answered my question, I will say very frankly I think the Senate is as much entitled to it, and more so, than any citizen of the United States, the Senate being a part of the treaty-making power. If the Senator will permit me, the point I am making is this: Does the Senator concede that the treaty is so formulated now that we are entitled, as a matter of right under the Constitution, to have it submitted to us for consideration?

Mr. KELLOGG. If the Senator's question is whether the treaty is at present completed sufficiently that the Senate may consider it for ratification, I should say no; but the Senate is entitled to know at this time the contents of that document, and there can be no harm, but the greatest good, accomplished by giving it to the Senate. A respectful request to the Secretary of

State to produce a copy of the treaty is without objection and should be made.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. KELLOGG. If the Secretary of State knows of any reason why it should not be produced, if it is not compatible with the public interest, he can so state, and then the Senate can consider whether his statement justifies the Senate in further insistence. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. The question which I propounded did not call for an answer as to the question of the expediency or policy, but the question of right, predicated upon the Constitution, and I ask the question again, with the permission of my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, because he has not answered it. Does the Senator say that the Senate, as a matter of right under the Constitution, is entitled now to have the treaty submitted to it by the President of the United States?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator is wrong.

Mr. KELLOGG. Not as a completed treaty for the purpose of ratification, but for the information of the Senate. As I said before, it is unbelievable that this treaty should be given out to private citizens without giving it to the Senate, and it should be resented by the Senate, and it should be resented by the people of this country who are entitled to know its contents.

In further answer to the Senator from Utah, ordinarily when commissioners or the President negotiate a treaty its terms are not given to the public either by synopsis or by publication of the entire text to a part of the world, but it is given to the Senate in confidence, and the Senate usually refers it to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The President or the high commissioners have not followed this ordinary custom of negotiating a treaty and first submitting it to the Senate, but they are negotiating a treaty and first submitting it to Germany and then to private citizens of this country, and third, at a time when it suits the convenience of the commissioners or the President, to the Senate of the United States. When the President or the commissioners, whoever is responsible, makes the treaty public by giving it out, either by a synopsis or a full text to the people of Germany or to the people of this country, or any of them, the Senate is entitled to the same rights that others enjoy, and indeed has a greater right. It should be given to the Senate first, and I can not see any way that it will embarrass or prejudice the negotiations at Paris or the President if this document is given to the Senate.

I know nothing of the pledges the President may have made. I have no desire that he should break his word to the statesmen of the allied nations. We do not know that he has given any pledge. We have read in the Associated Press—and that is the only information we have—that he has pledged himself, but the President has not so informed us nor has the Secretary of State nor any of the commissioners that they have given pledges that this treaty should not be published. We have read the synopsis in the public press. We are told that the treaty is in the hands of Germany and in the hands of private citizens in this country, and no one denies it. Under those circumstances we have the right to insist that it should have been given to us first.

Mr. PHELAN. If the Senator will yield to me I should like to ask him a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. PHELAN. It seems that some one has given out a copy of an inchoate treaty. The Senator does not pretend to say that it is the final treaty, but it is subject to possible objections by the German Government and to correction.

As I understand the Constitution and the law, and I am sure the Senator will agree with me, the Senate has no jurisdiction over the making of a treaty until it is submitted to the Senate by the President of the United States, and therefore it is not incumbent upon the President or anyone representing him either by courtesy or by legal requirement to submit a treaty which has not been finally negotiated between the high contracting parties. In fact, it would be in the nature of an affront to send to the Senate something that was not complete, and the Senate would have no jurisdiction of it until the President had complied with his constitutional duty to negotiate the treaty.

The Senate, therefore, in worrying over the absence of this pretended draft of a treaty is doing an idle thing, and I ask the Senator is it not the law that the President must first negotiate the treaty and then submit it to the Senate, and the Senate has no voice in the determination of the terms of that treaty until the

President has made his final report to the Senate submitting to the Senate the treaty?

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I think I am fully aware of the constitutional power of the Senate. The Senate has no constitutional power to ratify a treaty until it has been made. I quite agree that the Senate has the right and power to give its advice in any phase of any negotiation, and it has been frequently asked, and it may offer that advice without a request, because the question whether a treaty shall finally be made is decided by the Senate of the United States. Where a treaty has progressed so far that it has been formulated by the allied and associated governments and presented practically as an ultimatum to Germany, and has been published in Germany and in this country, as well as delivered to private citizens, the Senate has a constitutional right to it and may advise the President of its opinion as to any of the terms of the treaty. I think some of the advice the President has received from publicists and statesmen of the United States has been of some benefit to the American people.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit an inquiry there?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. KING. Is the right of the Senate any greater to tender the President advice than the right of the House of Representatives to tender him advice?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes, sir; because treaties are made with the advice and consent of the Senate and not of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate longer. What I have said is not uttered with a view to casting any obstacle in the way of the President. I agree, as I did during the entire course of the war, that the American people should be united, and that there should be no partisanship displayed in prosecuting the war or in adjusting foreign complications. I feel that this attitude should prevail now, that every Senator should act upon this great question according to his conscience and judgment, and that the American people have a right to express to their Senators their opinion by petition or otherwise. It is because I desire that the American people shall have accurate information and that Senators may have accurate information on which to found their opinions and advice that I am impelled to vote for the pending resolution.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I was so much impressed very shortly after I was sworn in as a Member of this deliberative body with the action on the part of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], when he held up to the view of the Senate a very large volume of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, purporting to be, as I recall it, the oral contributions of the last 10 days of the last session, that illustration being perhaps a forerunner of a little less deliberation and more action from the Sixty-sixth Congress, that I do not want to offend and take more than a moment of the time of the Senate to express a single thought in connection with this resolution.

While I am, may I say, still fresh from the country outside of the Senate Chamber, and perhaps have not yet absorbed the germ which seems in a way to develop long arguments, many of which, however, are very interesting and instructive, I believe that the passage of this resolution is important, particularly as a protest from the Senate of the United States to our representatives in Paris, not that the Secretary of State because of the passage of this resolution would probably send—for he probably would not—the peace treaty to this body, but rather that we shall send directly on the passage of the resolution to our representatives abroad this viewpoint—that we are not criticizing necessarily the action, which was undoubtedly deemed proper and necessary, agreeing with the representatives of other major nations originally, that the peace treaty should not be made public. That was perhaps in every way justified; I know nothing to the contrary; but conditions have certainly changed.

To-day it is a well-established fact that the peace treaty is in the hands of people in various sections of the world; and by the passage of this resolution we at least present the feeling of this body, representing the people of the country, that, if such an understanding was justified some weeks ago, to-day, at least, under existing circumstances, if it is necessary for us to officially pass a resolution to demonstrate it, the President of the United States should insist at another meeting with Clemenceau, Lloyd-George, and those with whom he has agreed, that the ban of secrecy under present conditions should be lifted, and that the Senate of the United States should be possessed of the document that is now apparently in the hands of the people of so many countries of the world.

For that reason I feel that the resolution is very important, so as to give that thought and that sentiment to the President, representing us, and we representing the people.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I had intended to say something on the resolution presented by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] this morning. The opportunity, however, did not present itself. I shall say something which may be relevant to that resolution, notwithstanding the fact that it has gone to the committee, and then submit a few observations with reference to the pending resolution.

I should have been satisfied to have left the treaty to be published at the pleasure of the President if the action of the peace conference had been confined to the question of making a treaty; but when the peace conference assumed the responsibility of not only formulating a treaty with the enemy, but of incorporating in that treaty what the President in France a few days ago stated in unmistakable terms to be a super-government for the world, then this whole matter became something more than a treaty.

It became a matter of grave concern not only to the treaty-making power, technically speaking, but a matter of the utmost concern to the American people to know just what kind of a supergovernment we were to have and how it is incorporated in the treaty, and why, as Mr. Taft repeats night after night, it is indispensable to the performance and execution of the treaty. In other words, we are facing a situation such as has never before confronted us, such as the men who framed the Constitution and provided for the treaty-making power never contemplated, to wit, a situation in which we are not only making a treaty, properly speaking, but under the guise of making a treaty are indeed changing the entire structure of our Government.

So I say—and I suspect that is the attitude of mind of the able Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]—that had these two matters been entirely divorced and the treaty with Germany had remained, as these things were contemplated by those who provided for the treaty-making power, distinctly and separately a treaty, there would have been very little discussion as to its publicity until such time as the President saw fit to make it public. But the league of nations incorporated in the treaty is being discussed from one end of the land to the other, and it is being constantly stated to the American people that the two are inseparably connected, and that the treaty with Germany can not be made effective without the league of nations. While that debate is going on by some one who assumes to know what the terms of the treaty are, those who are opposed to the league of nations are placed at the disadvantage of debating something as to which the retort is made to us, "You do not know anything about it." There is scarcely a night passes but Mr. Taft alights from his special car and tells the American people what the contents of this treaty are, while the American people know nothing about it through those upon whom is devolved the responsibility of knowing under the Constitution. Should not both sides and all parties and the people generally have equal opportunity to know the contents and terms of the treaty?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator from Idaho assure the Senate that he knows personally that Mr. Taft makes statements of that character concerning this treaty?

Mr. BORAH. I have read it over and over again until it has become perfectly familiar—as I have no doubt the Senator has heard over and over again, as I understand he has been out with Mr. Taft—I have read over and over again that Mr. Taft says the treaty with Germany can not be made effective and can not be carried out and executed without the league of nations being incorporated in and made a part of it. If that is true, it presupposes that Mr. Taft is familiar with all the details of the treaty, which he says can not be executed without the league of nations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, I can say to the Senator that, from the several times that I have heard Mr. Taft speak, practically his whole discussion is upon the league of nations, of which we have official copies here published by the Senate, word for word, and concerning which there is no need to make any other inquiry as to its contents; that aside from that the only statement Mr. Taft makes is that it will be necessary to create some international machinery—he does not say what—to carry into effect a treaty against Germany and to compel her to observe that treaty after it is signed. That is the extent, the beginning and the end, of what Mr. Taft says.

Mr. BORAH. I thank the Senator for his contribution. It sustains precisely what I have said, to wit, that Mr. Taft reiterates that the peace treaty must be carried out through and by means of machinery provided by the league of nations. Now,

how does Mr. Taft know that the details of the treaty can not be executed other than by the machinery of the league of nations unless he knows something about the treaty?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator from Idaho tell us what compulsion there is going to be to require Germany to observe the terms of the treaty if the various nations make the treaty and go home and leave nothing to require and to compel Germany to carry out its terms?

Mr. BORAH. That is what I say.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is all that Mr. Taft says.

Mr. BORAH. Well, that is precisely what I say. Mr. Taft says that this treaty can not be executed unless the league of nations is created and the machinery of the league is put into operation. There have been a vast number of treaties in the last 150 years made and executed without the league of nations, and it is not entirely clear to an obtuse mind, like some of us are supposed unfortunately to possess, why that could not be true again, unless there are some peculiar terms and conditions written into the German treaty of which we have no knowledge and of which Mr. Taft has sufficient knowledge. One reason why we want the treaty is because we believe it can be shown that the league is not necessary to the treaty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to put some questions to the Senator from Idaho, if he will permit. Will the Senator from Idaho tell the public how it is going to be possible to insure the existence of Poland, which is necessarily set up under the terms of this treaty, and must be set up, no matter what they are; what means are to be adopted to secure the independence of Czechoslovakia, which we all have agreed must be a new nation, created under the terms of this treaty? Can the Senator answer those two questions? Is the United States going to guarantee the existence of those countries? Is Great Britain going to guarantee the existence of those countries? Can Germany be depended upon to permit the existence of those countries?

The Senator from Idaho can very well see that there is no possibility in carrying out the very purpose of this war, unless some machinery is set up of an international character to carry out the will of the countries that are imposing this peace upon Germany.

Mr. BORAH. I suppose the Senator would also include Shantung along with Poland?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, I will be satisfied if the Senator from Idaho will merely answer the questions I have asked.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I will answer.

I do not know how you are going to carry out the plans which have been formulated at Versailles without knowing the terms of the treaty, and I do not know how you are going to do it with a league of nations such as you have formed. The league of nations which you have formed is as powerless and ineffective to do what the Senator in his fancy contemplates that he and Mr. Taft are going to do as anything of which I can conceive. It has absolutely no power to do anything, except superinduce and bring on war, and it is utterly without power to prevent war or carry on war when it comes. It is almost perfect to bring on war. In fact, with such things in it as Shantung it practically guarantees war. But it is wholly inefficient to prevent war.

I was going to say, Mr. President, when interrupted by the Senator from Nebraska, that we would have been content to have left the treaty where it now is in the hands of the Executive and with certain Governments of Europe and certain people in New York had the matter been divorced from the league. But when they became intertwined and interlaced, the ex-President constantly insisting to the American people that a great danger arises out of the breakdown of that treaty with Germany without the league attached to it, it becomes necessary for those who are concerned in it to know its details.

Again, Mr. President, when the President of the United States took his second departure for our foreign capital he advised the people of the United States that when the treaty with Germany came back here the league of nations would be so interwoven with it, its conditions and its terms, that those who were opposed to the league of nations would find it exceedingly difficult to disentangle and disengage the two instruments, and, therefore, if we did not propose to delay peace we would be compelled to accept the league of nations, whether we desired it or not. I think that is a fair statement of what the President said; it is certainly a fair statement of what the President intended.

Now, what is the situation? We have the league of nations in its present form. We have no knowledge whatever of the manner in which it is intertwined or interwoven with the treaty itself, and yet we are advised by no less an authority than the negotiator of the treaty that it was the desire and purpose of

those with whom he was associated so to intertwine it with the treaty that we would have to accept the league or else postpone the treaty of peace. Are we not entitled, therefore, in view of the task which is imposed upon us and the difficult undertaking which has been put up behind closed doors in Paris for us to deal with, to have both instruments and to know precisely how we are to meet the situation?

I want you to reflect for a moment upon the situation which confronts the Senate of the United States. A conclave of ambassadors, sitting behind closed doors at Versailles, have deliberately sat down to the task of imposing upon the American people, whether they want it or not, a league of nations by so linking that league up with the treaty of peace, which, in some form we do want, that we have to take the former in order to get the latter. They have had weeks and months to frame up their scheme so as to make it impossible for the American people to have a deliberate choice as to the two propositions. Perhaps never in the history of the world was it ever before deliberately determined to deprive a free people of a choice or of the right of selecting between two propositions—whether they would take one and leave the other or whether they would surrender their judgment upon one rather than refuse the other. But this is the situation which confronts us, and the instrument by which this is accomplished is now in possession of all the world, practically, except the people of the United States.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] said this morning, and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] reiterated it, that there is a disposition upon this side of the Chamber to assail the President personally. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] thought the mere statement that the treaty of peace was at large in this country was a criticism of the President. Let me say now, once for all in this debate, because I presume it will continue for some time, that, so far as the President is concerned as President or in his individual capacity, separated and divorced from this scheme of a league of nations, I have no personal feeling which I propose or wish to gratify here or elsewhere; but, in so far as he is attempting what, in my judgment, is a betrayal of the independence and sovereignty of this Republic into the hands of foreign powers, there is no energy that I possess and no intellectual power which is mine that I will not exert here and elsewhere to frustrate his designs. I do not challenge other men's motives; I am not discussing the league of nations from the viewpoint of other men, and therefore I do not assail individuals; but, as I view it from my standpoint, from the vision which I get into the future, if I should do less than all that is within my power to frustrate that design, I would feel that I had written myself down beside the betrayers of the American people. The Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Nebraska, much as I admire them personally and little as I desire to quarrel with them, will make no progress with the Senator from Idaho by charging personal assault on the President. I intend at no time, unless driven to it, to engage in such tactics. But I do propose to speak freely and sincerely of this scheme as I see it, and that is a surrender of the dearest rights of a free people to the domination and control of foreign powers. This is not merely the negotiation and completion and ratification of a treaty. Those of us who view it as we do—and the Senator from Nebraska no doubt thinks it is our misfortune—look at it in an entirely different light, and no individual can stand between me and anything that I can do to defeat what I consider a treacherous scheme to forfeit those rights and privileges, without which we would be without power to choose our own policies or determine our own future.

Furthermore, the President said in his Decoration Day address a few days ago that those who were opposing this scheme were placing themselves in the same position and in the same attitude as the men who opposed the formation of the American Union, and that we would be just as ashamed in time to come as those who had attempted to thwart the efforts of the patriots who finally consummated the organization of our free institutions and set in operation the Constitution of the United States. I can not conceive of a more vicious attack upon the loyalty and patriotism of Senators or citizens than that attack and all which it implies. Does anyone suppose, now that the enemy are conquered, the war is over, and, thank God, free speech has been restored in the American Republic, that all the attacks in this fight are going to be on one side? If the supporters of the league prefer that style of debate, there will be blows to give as well as blows to take.

Neither the times from which the President chooses his figure nor the facts connected which his figure recalls are entirely happy. We might well retort that those who are now trying to place the people of the United States in a league which will be controlled or dominated by European powers and under the Eu-

ropean system are the legitimate descendants of the Tories who insisted that the patriots of 1776 were making a great mistake in trying to establish and maintain here upon the Western Continent a free, independent, self-governing people, that which we who oppose the league are now contending for.

The time is here, the hour has struck, when men must speak boldly and without hesitation, and leave time to judge who are disloyal to American institutions.

When Mr. Taft opened his campaign in Portland, Oreg., after the first draft of the league, he declared that certain Senators, mentioning their names, were not to be trusted overnight, unfit, in other words, either in morals or patriotism, to be heard or heeded. Let those who are on the inside, who are in possession of all the documents, like the President and apparently the ex-President, make public those documents and give all parties the information to which they are entitled and then let them proceed to the debate upon a high plane and the discussion of the subject upon its merits and we will be glad to conform to their method of debate. But if they prefer the other style of warfare it may be that necessity will require us to conform to that also.

Mr. President, I stated on the floor of the Senate the other day that it was understood there were copies of this treaty in New York in the hands of business interests. I have no doubt about that at all. I did not say anything in my statement which indicated that the President had delivered those copies to those interests. On the other hand, I stated specifically that I assumed when the President ascertained that these interests had gotten hold of them he would feel that he was relieved from the arrangement he had made with the associated Governments and would publish the treaty to the American people. I have no right to assume, and I have not assumed, that the President would deliver these copies to these persons in New York, and it is not necessary for the Senator from Nebraska to go so far as to draw that inference from anything I said. If he is anxious to turn the matter into a reflection it must be either by reason of his misguided zeal or because he is unconsciously betraying knowledge personal to himself.

Mr. President, there are a great many people in Paris, and some of them are as thoroughly intertwined with the business interests of New York as the league of nations will be intertwined with the German treaty when we get it back here. I have in my own mind very little doubt as to how those copies of the treaty got to New York. We have had investigations heretofore which showed how quick some men who had been trusted transmitted information to Wall Street, and millions have been made by them, as they have confessed themselves, by inside information which they had. I do not attack or assail the President. I simply say that it is my belief the copies are there; they can be had; and it is immaterial to me whence they came. I believe those who are greatly concerned undoubtedly in all of the terms of the treaty, and especially interested in some provisions of it, have the document before them. I do not say I know it. I have not seen the documents, and yet I feel I know it; I am just as well satisfied that they are there, and have been for the last 10 days, as I can be of anything which I have not seen with my own eyes.

I did not make the statement, Mr. President, for any other purpose than to help get the treaty published. That is the only thing in which I am interested, and I feel that the Senator from Nebraska would concede that if copies of the treaty are at large, and have been put into hands which are semipublic, certainly nothing can be lost by their being sent here.

Again, Mr. President, we know that the treaty has been published in Germany for the last several days, according to the Associated Press, the only source of information in these days of "open covenants openly arrived at." We know that it has been published in Berlin, and that copies are in Switzerland, in Denmark, in Holland, in Norway, and in Sweden, and are circulating throughout the world. I take it, therefore, that no possible advantage can be derived by the Germans by reason of the fact that we should be given the information. Nothing can be conveyed from here to Germany that Germany has not had for weeks, and if any disturbance should arise by reason of the publication of the treaty it will not be a disturbance in Germany, but it will be a disturbance among the many millions of American people who still love and are deeply concerned over things which relate to the life and honor of this old Republic. The disturbance will be among those who believe that the treaty, with the league intertwined and the obligations which it imposes upon us, will be such that, if accepted, would be detrimental to our interests and at war with our future happiness and tranquillity.

Suppose it should appear in this treaty, as has been stated to the public, that it ratifies the outrage upon China by the Ger-

mans in 1905; suppose it should appear unmistakably that in 1905 the German Government went into China and took possession of Shantung or certain interests therein by force and held them in the same way until after the breaking out of this war, when Japan, another military power, took possession of those interests under a solemn pledge to return them to the Chinese people at the end of the war; suppose it should appear that this outrage has been perpetuated and underwritten and guaranteed—by whom? By the man power, the sons and brothers and fathers, of the United States.

When that comes to be well understood by the American people the disturbance over the treaty will be under the American flag and not in Germany. It would seem to be the judgment of the American people that is feared.

These are the things, Mr. President, which have been foreshadowed, and which, by reason of the obligations which we are assuming under the league, are of transcendent moment, not to the Senate alone but to all the people of the United States; and therefore we are asking for the text of the treaty in order that we may not only have it ourselves but that those whom we represent may have it.

Why are Mr. Taft and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hitchcock] and this combination of able gentlemen presenting this matter to the American people? Mr. Taft has advised us why. He proposes to make public opinion so strong, so irresistible, according to his statement, that the American Senate can be and will be whipped into submission. Are we not entitled to have public opinion informed on both sides of the question? Are they so afraid of the justice and wisdom of the cause as to feel under the necessity of withholding from us the facts that both sides may be presented?

A great New York paper, perhaps one of the great newspapers in the world, the other day said in its editorial columns that the Senate of the United States must ratify the treaty for the same reason that the Germans must sign it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. That newspaper said the Senate of the United States must ratify the treaty for the same reason that the Germans must sign it. That is the point at which we have arrived in this discussion. A dictatorial power, speaking as if by authority within a short distance of where these treaties have been circulating for the last 10 days, notifies the American Senate that it must act as the Germans act, under force and duress!

I say to this newspaper we will not consider it and pass upon it whipped, coerced, and forced like a conquered people. This paper and all kindred spirits, so anxious to hasten their country into this compromising alliance with foreign powers, will learn that the Senate will deal with this question as becomes American Senators. We will debate and we will have the facts upon which to debate, and some, at least, will disregard threatened coercion. Those who are urging this surrender of American rights will have to meet their antagonists in the open field of fair and free discussion, and deal with the question upon its merits.

I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The Senator has spoken of Mr. Taft endeavoring to create this sentiment. I want to call his attention and the attention of the Senate to the fact that the chairman of the Democratic national committee, accompanied by the Secretary to the President, is now touring the country under the somewhat—well, let me not characterize it—under the claim of calling together the State committees for the purpose of consulting with reference to the party welfare, but that in each instance the business transacted is the discussion of the league of nations; and the effort is made, and I think generally successfully, to have an official ratification by the Democratic State committees of the league of nations, thus seeking to commit the Democratic Party to this league, and to do that at a time when the terms of the league itself are not yet submitted to the American people; and this distinguished chairman has gone further, and in substance has asserted that he is the representative of the President in this business.

So that if the country is to be committed, or if the Democratic Party is to be committed, to a league of nations which is intertwined with the treaty so that they are inseparable, and if the treaty of peace also contains clauses which have not yet been made public, which are in fact agreements with reference to the future government of the world, it seems to me that before public opinion is formed and forced in this way at least the public might have the evidence in the case laid before it.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield for just a moment in connection with the remarks just made by the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator has criticized quite severely some people who are trying to create sentiment in favor of this league. If his criticism is justified, I should like to ask him whether his criticism would not apply with equal force to those who have been making speeches over the country against the league of nations?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I shall answer that with very great pleasure, with the consent of the Senator whose time I am taking.

There was submitted to the Senate, or rather there has been submitted to the country—yes, submitted to the Senate—a document said to constitute the agreement of the league of nations. It was sent here, it was said, for discussion. We proceeded to discuss it, and the country proceeded to discuss it. Subsequently it was amended. In that amended form the country proceeded to discuss it. The point I am making is that it is now said that there are in the treaty of peace certain provisions and conditions which modify and which affect the league of nations, so called, in the most radical way; and, without that being submitted to the country, without that being submitted to the Senate, and in advance of it, the Secretary to the President—who, of course, goes out as his spokesman, and who has professed to speak for him—and the chairman of the Democratic National Committee have been trying to commit the Democratic organization to this document, when the complete document is not before us.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, not only have we, as I say, the ex-President and the able, faithful chairman of the Democratic National Committee presenting arguments to the country why this treaty and league should be accepted, but all kinds of arguments are being presented to us from our considerate friends abroad. We are not quite free to settle this matter among ourselves, but day by day and week after week there appear in some of the leading papers of the country, if not all of them, an argument presented by our friends across the sea telling the American people how if they falter they will disappoint the world and chaos will come if they do not accept a league of nations to guarantee the integrity of the British Empire.

I read what appeared yesterday. This is from Lord Robert Cecil. The deep-seated and profound solicitude of this family for the welfare of this country is hereditary. It was his famous father who in the midst of our Civil War and when free institutions needed friends declared, "The people of the South are the natural allies of England; the North, on the other hand, keeps an opposition shop." A high standard, but not an unfamiliar one. Could he have had his way our Union would have been torn in twain and the cause of free institutions put back a thousand years. Knowing, therefore, something of the standards and ideals of this family in dealing with the cause of this country, let us appreciate Lord Cecil's anxiety for our morals and his conception of our obligations.

I read:

I see it suggested in some places that the United States should not accept membership in the league of nations because it might involve some sacrifice of national sovereignty. It would be foolish to deny that if nations are to make any organizations for peace each of them must be content to modify in some degree, however slight, its liberty of action. That is the inevitable result of cooperation, and I do not wish to underrate the sacrifice involved; but, after all, nothing is worth doing in this world that can be done without a sacrifice, and if any real change in the present international status is to take place it can only be because the nations of the world are so convinced of the evils of war that they are ready to risk something to prevent its occurrence in the future.

Yes, Mr. President; involving some sacrifice, some surrender of sovereignty! May I ask what sacrifice the country of which this gentleman is so prominent a citizen will make when it enters this league of nations? What possible sacrifice has the British Government made by reason of its joining the league?

We heard a great deal in this country before we went over to Versailles about the freedom of the seas. You have not heard anything about it since. Great Britain notified the courteous gentlemen from the other countries that the question of the freedom of the seas was not a matter which came within the jurisdiction of the Versailles conference. Why? That left to Great Britain her dominancy of the sea, which, with her additional power secured by reason of this war, enables her to dominate the world inside the league or outside the league. Her supreme navy and her dominancy of the sea is her foreign policy, and to it all other nations must bow. That which was essential to her independence and her sovereignty and her power was excluded from the consideration of the Versailles conference at the first sitting.

England, when this treaty is signed, will control one-fourth of the inhabited globe and dominate one-third of its entire population. Her guns are trained across every strategic path

of the sea. She has her forts and her fortified harbors and her coaling stations and her islands in every part of the inhabitable globe. With her supreme navy and the seas within her control, she is in complete domination of the league of nations from the very first hour that it is organized.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Just a minute and I will yield to the Senator. Now, I ask, what has England sacrificed? By virtue of this war she will acquire territory directly or indirectly almost as large as the United States. She has acquired people over whom she will exercise control to the number of about 33,000,000. She has not surrendered one iota of her sovereignty or her power as an independent nation, as I shall show in a few minutes, by virtue of her voting power in the league. On the other hand, Mr. President, the moment we enter this league we change our entire policy of a century and a half. That which has been regarded as our safety and our security, which has enabled us to strengthen and to grow through this century and a half, the policy of Washington, is surrendered. The minute we enter the league we not only surrender the policy of Washington, but we surrender the policy established by Monroe. Those policies which have distinguished us through all these years and enabled us to acquire the commanding position which we now hold among the nations of the world, which enabled us to enter this war in the full panoply of power, and practically to determine the cause of civilization, are to be surrendered. I ask any candid man what does England surrender in compensation for this? What great national policy does she forego? What tradition does she reject? What right, privilege, or prestige does she sacrifice?

"Ah," Lord Robert Cecil says, "some sacrifice has to be made."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. Not only has England retained her policy but she has acquired an additional advantage. Under and inside of this league of nations, covered by it, is the same old balance of power—a combination or an alliance of Great Britain and France and the United States, so that Great Britain not only has her old balance of power with the United States to take the place of Russia, but she has, in addition to that, the league of nations, which she absolutely controls by her votes, to guarantee the territorial integrity of one-fourth of the inhabitable globe, and to hold in constant subjection one-third of the inhabitants of the earth. If the league works, very well, she controls it; if the league breaks down, very well, she has her balance of power with America as her ally.

I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I was present in the Senate here on the 26th of May, when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] made a very ferocious attack upon the league of nations, and I think the Senator from Idaho listened to him. The burden of that attack was that this league of nations was to be dominated by some 17 small nations of color; and I did not hear the Senator from Idaho dissent from that claim at that time. I should like the Senator from Idaho now to state whether he agrees with the Senator from Missouri, his colleague in these attacks, that this league is to be dominated by these 17 small nations of color, or is it to be dominated by Great Britain?

Mr. BORAH. It will be dominated by Great Britain when Great Britain is interested, for Great Britain dominates the 17 small nations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Oh, that is the idea? I am glad to have some reconciliation effected, because I was distressed over the thought that this league of nations would otherwise have two masters.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I have observed the distress of the Senator for several days; it seems verging on despair.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. At an earlier date we were told that it was to be dominated by the kings and potentates of Europe and Asia, and then it got to be Great Britain, and finally it got to be these petty nations that the Senator from Missouri classified. Now I understand that the Senator from Idaho goes back to the old claim that it is to be dominated by the British Empire.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. REED. Nobody is so dense as a man who purposely closes his ears and shuts up his mind. What I said was perfectly plain, and has been once explained to the Senator from Nebraska, and explained in language so simple that I am sure he understood it; but, so that it may appear in the Record again at this time, I will restate it, with the courtesy of the Senator.

We heard for months a great deal about a league of nations. We read through the press excerpts of what it was claimed was to go into this league. In the month of November or December—I have forgotten which—I made a speech in opposition to this league of nations in progress of formation, and I started with the assumption that such a league, if it had force, would necessarily embrace the principal nations of Europe, and I said that if it did embrace the principal nations of Europe there would be a certain number of kingdoms represented and there would be certain Asiatic powers. I assumed then that this league would be what the President had said it must be, a league embracing the principal nations of the world; and I showed that if it did embrace the principal nations of the world there would be only two or three republics and a large number of kingdoms, with the exception of the governments that were in process of formation, the character of which we could not yet tell.

That was my speech, that the Senator has referred to, in which I said that kings would dominate. They would have dominated in that kind of a league. They would have dominated if the league had been formed as the President said he was going to form one, embracing all the principal nations of the world.

Later we obtained a copy of the league of nations, which gave us the information that there were five nations—France, Japan, Italy, Great Britain, and the United States—which were to constitute the members, and certain other nations named in a secret protocol, the names of the nations being kept from us.

I discussed that question, and I assumed at that time that the backward nations, the half-civilized nations, would not come into the league, and I discussed the question from that standpoint. Finally we were given the list of these nations, and to my astonishment, and I think to the astonishment of every man, we found Liberia, and Haiti and Hedjaz, and Honduras, and Nicaragua, and Siam, and India, and other half-civilized or retrograde nations placed in the league with the power each to cast a vote in the league the equal of the vote of the United States or the equal of the vote of any other nation. I discussed that, and called attention to the fact that the nations of dark skin were in the majority, and that on any race question they would be very likely to vote together and vote for the dark-skinned proposition. I also called attention to the fact that what had been previously denied—denied by my friend and denied by others—that Great Britain would have five votes in the league had been disclosed now was six votes, and that Great Britain had a preponderating influence in the league because of those six votes.

The Senator can call those contradictory statements if he wants to, but they are absolutely consistent. The only change is that we have been more and more finding out the iniquities of this monstrous document.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I want to make this observation: The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has detailed to us the difficulty he had in arriving at a basis for his discussion of the league of nations. It just occurred to me that it might have been advisable for him to wait until he got the league of nations before he began the discussion; and I should like to suggest, with reference to the treaty of peace, that it might be a good thing for Senators to withhold their discussion until they know what it is.

Mr. REED. Exactly.

Mr. BORAH. Let me answer that by saying this: It would have been better for the Senator from Missouri to have joined the League to Enforce Peace, and then one of the contributors to that league, who seems to be in possession of the document at this time, could have informed him of what the contents were. There seems to be a conduit between the League to Enforce Peace and those who possess the information with reference to the contents of this treaty, and I hope that when the Senator begins his investigation he will call first some of the most prominent members of the League to Enforce Peace.

Now, I want to call attention to how another sacrifice has been made by Great Britain.

We first have the council, composed of five great powers, all of whom, except the United States, are interlinked with secret treaties—secret treaties which Mr. Balfour has been candid enough to say would not be abrogated, notwithstanding the league of nations—secret treaties between Japan and Great Britain, and Italy and Great Britain, and we are to have one between France and Great Britain, so we are advised. But, Mr. President, we go from the council to the assembly, and we

see something perfectly fascinating in its audacity. It really is a stroke of genius, such as no other nation, in my judgment, ever had the genius to suggest, and no other nation except the United States has had the inverted genius to accept.

The members of this league are, first, the United States of America; second, Great Britain. That ought to have ended the proposition. The United States has one vote, Great Britain one vote.

Now, tell me, Senators, who still have some regard for this country and who do not regret that your ancestors came here, upon what possible theory would you proceed further in foreign affairs in reference to foreign nations than to give Great Britain and the United States the same number of votes? But, they say, naming the British Empire—which includes Canada—then Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, India. Is there any possible reason why India or New Zealand should have a vote in that assembly and not the State of Minnesota? Are not New Zealand and India just as completely controlled in foreign affairs by the foreign office of Great Britain as Minnesota is in our foreign affairs by the United States? Is there any difference between giving India, New Zealand, and Australia a vote and giving it to New Mexico or Ohio or even the New State of Idaho? Upon what possible theory? It arises out of the supreme desire of the English nation to show that it is sacrificing something in this grand scheme of cooperation. Six votes to our one in the assembly, and that assembly, do not forget, is a matter of tremendous moment under this new covenant.

Both in the council and in the assembly, wherever a majority vote is sufficient, Europe and Asia will completely dominate every situation. The whole thing will be completely in their hands. We will be under the voting power of foreigners. In all cases where unanimous vote is required the situation, in many respects, will be worse. While it is true that in some instances we could check affirmative action, so could any nation of Europe check affirmative action on our part. If we as a nation or people should feel under the necessity of urging affirmative action as essential to peace or to our own protection, one nation could veto anything we might desire to do. If we wanted to move, for instance, to enforce the Monroe doctrine, one nation, Japan or New Zealand, could veto our action. If we desired to prevent colonization of the Japanese immigration upon the Western Continent, one nation could veto that right. In other words, this great Republic must bow in shameless subservience to foreign powers and depend for all time in the future as to its policies upon what foreign nations will deem wise and proper.

So, Mr. President, I challenge any man upon this floor or, if my weak voice can be heard in the House of Parliament, I ask any Englishman to state where sacrifice has been made upon the part of the British Government in entering into this league of nations. It is in a position to dominate and control and direct its policies just the same as it to-day directs and controls the policies of the British Empire; and never for a single moment did it lose sight of that proposition, from the first step in the writing of the league until it was completed.

Just a word, Mr. President, with reference to another matter, and I will conclude. A good deal has been said in the last 10 days with reference to this being a party question. Unfortunately, I presume, I hold a little different opinion about this than most of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber. Therefore I do not assume to speak for anyone but myself.

The able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] said the other day in his address that he regretted very much a tendency upon this side of the Chamber to make this a partisan question, and that, while they were desirous of holding it out of party politics upon that side, there was a disposition here to force it into party politics. My friend from Arkansas had not lately visited the Isle of Patmos. He should have sought a later revelation.

Why, at the very time he was speaking here upon the floor of the Senate the chairman of the Democratic committee in Chicago was making it a party issue and was so declaring to the entire country, if the Associated Press dispatch be a correct statement of what he said and was so declaring. He declared he welcomed it as a party issue, and then proceeded to put the party brand upon it.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. In just a moment. If you will read the Associated Press dispatch from Chicago in the Washington Post of May 29, you will see I am correct. I have not seen it denied. In other words, he pointed to many achievements of the Democratic Party, and, of course, pointed to the record of Mr. Wilson, which was proper, and then pointed to the league of nations as the greatest issue of the party and the greatest achievement of all time. A party issue! The second night before the President left for Europe he called his party organiza-

tion in conference. Mr. Cummings hastened from the White House to the first public rostrum, and in a public speech announced that the Democratic Party was supporting the league and that those who were opposed to it were opposing it for party reasons. By this declaration by the chairman of the party made a few hours after consultation with the President, this league was made a party question, so far as the Democratic Party is concerned.

During the recess of Congress I had the pleasure of visiting some 11 States of the Union in the discussion of this matter. I crossed the path of the able chairman several times. There was no place where he visited and no council which he called in which it was not left unmistakably within the knowledge of the public that the Democratic Party as a party is behind the league of nations. It was everywhere understood that support of the league is a test of party loyalty. There is not an informed man in Washington who does not know that to be true.

It has been a party issue, Mr. President, ever since the President of the United States called his conference, and Mr. Cummings now is traveling over the country organizing in every part of the country, and one of the principal arguments in favor of the Democratic Party, as he puts it, is the covenant of the league of nations.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not know that my recollection of the press reports of the Chicago meeting is any better than that of the Senator from Idaho, but if my recollection is correct, the chairman of the Democratic committee took the position that the league of nations should be ratified—that it should not be made a party issue.

Mr. BORAH. No, Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. But that if any other party wanted to force it as a party issue, he was ready to take up the fight. I would like to concur in that suggestion. If there is any party that wants to make it a party issue, the Democrats of this country, in my judgment, will welcome the issue.

Mr. BORAH. There is no use for the Senator from New Mexico to occupy my time with that proposition. The Senator from New Mexico knows infinitely better than the Senator from Idaho that it is a party issue in the Democratic Party now and has been ever since the covenant was first announced. There is not a Democrat in the country who does not know that his party as a party is supporting it.

I noticed the other day there was a nonpartisan dinner in New York in favor of the league of nations. The gentleman who presided at that dinner was a distinguished Democratic judge, and the main speaker was the nonpartisan chairman of the Democratic Party, Mr. Cummings, and the other speaker was that gentleman whom we all know is nonpartisan in all his actions, Mr. McAdoo.

If you will read the report of his speech in the New York papers you will have no doubt about the fact that while Mr. McAdoo always desires to be nonpartisan, he is so obsessed with the idea of the league of nations and that it will be so helpful to the Democratic Party that he was forced to admit that it was the greatest achievement of the party of which he is a member.

Mr. President, there is only one objection which I make to that, and that is it takes so much credit from our friend Mr. Taft. I do not think it is fair to deprive that distinguished gentleman of his proportion of the glory. Is it true, Mr. President, that they pay a vast amount of deference to Mr. Taft? The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] went so far the other day as to say that since Mr. Taft began to advocate the league of nations he had redeemed himself before the American people. Mr. Taft will doubtless realize that he was once in a fallen state and that redemption came by his supporting a league of nations, which league of nations Mr. Cummings tells us is a Democratic achievement.

Mr. President, how could you prevent its becoming a party issue. Let us test the question first by mere party tactics or expediency and then let us test it by a higher standard. Let us suppose the league is defeated. It will necessarily be defeated by Republican votes. Will the Democratic Party then abandon the fight; will it not in 1920 then point to its defeat, denounce the Republican Party for defeating it, and then go to the country declaring that a great plan for world peace had been frustrated by the Republican Party? And will the Republican Party indorse the declaration of the Democrats and admit its mistake? If it does not, then will it not be an issue to fight out in the campaign? It is simply impossible to keep this out of the campaign in some way in 1920. It is not an ordinary treaty, interest in which will die out when ratified or defeated. It is a matter of tremendous political moment, one which has aroused the people deeply, and one upon which they will ultimately be heard.

Suppose, on the other hand, the league is ratified. The Democratic Party, as its distinguished chairman and Mr. McAdoo are already claiming, will point to it as the great achievement of the party. Even if we should support it as Republicans we will be given no credit. You will recall how faithfully we supported the war. But 10 days before the election the President made the war and all questions growing out of the war a party issue. He appealed directly to the people to elect a Democratic Congress. Whether we vote for or against the league the Democratic Party is already claiming it and will claim it is a party issue. I trust we are not without the wisdom which comes from experience after the last six years.

But, Mr. President, let us test this upon a higher plane. There is a deeper and profounder reason why it must be a party issue. It should not be made a party issue for mere party advantage. I agree to that. I agree, further, that no man should support or oppose it because his party tells him to do so, but this is a question upon which the American people are widely separated and irreconcilably divided. Those who are in favor of it will so express themselves and those who are opposed to it will express their opposition. How can they do so except through party action? Under our form of government the people can only speak effectively through political organizations called political parties. There are hundreds and thousands and millions of people in this country who will want to elect a President and a Congress in 1920 opposed to the policy of this country meddling in European affairs. If by our act here we commit this country to such a policy no power can prevent the issue being settled by a popular vote in 1920. You can not disfranchise a people by the political parties in power joining upon a certain issue. You can monopolize almost anything in this country. But you can not monopolize the right of the people to organize a political party. And the only possible way that the masses can effectuate their purposes is to act through political parties and organizations.

I have been in 11 States of the Union since Congress closed and I entertain no doubt at all that the great mass of the people are against any principle which will take their sons to Europe to do police service or to protect European boundaries. I have no doubt they are unalterably opposed to this thing of entering into the broils and turmoils of Europe. Do you suppose these people will consent to be deprived of their votes in this manner? If the Democratic Party indorses and the Republican Party indorses or remains silent, do you think they will yield up their loyalty to their country for loyalty to their party? If you do, you are doomed to disillusionment. I am making no threats; I am stating a fact. On this great question the people are ahead of their leaders. Their hearts are sounder and their minds clearer.

I expect to see the Republican Party true to its traditions, loyal to its teachings for half a century, loyal to the precepts which brought it into existence, declare in favor of remaining aloof from European alliances and in favor of Europe remaining out of American affairs. I expect to see it declare in favor of the untrammelled sovereignty and independence of this Republic. I expect to see it declare that no power except the power of this Government, through the processes of government, shall ever have the right to commit this country to war, either directly or indirectly. I expect to see it declare in favor of bringing the boys out of Europe and keeping them out of Europe unless our own Republic shall be threatened, and if it is threatened we will determine that and not some foreign council. But it is just as certain to my mind as anything in the future can be that if the two old parties should favor a contrary policy some other means will be found through and by means of which the people will express and effectuate their views.

Why, Senators, shall we say that the question of how much tariff shall be levied is a party issue but whether we shall entangle ourselves in European affairs is not a party issue? Shall we say that the question of who secured woman suffrage is a stupendous party issue but the question of whether or not we shall hold intact the Monroe doctrine is no concern of a party? Shall we say that the question of economy is a party issue but the question of whether our Government shall remain free and independent as it was organized is of no concern to our party? Reflect for a moment what a miserable coward you are making of the party of which you are members. Shall we say that the amount of taxes which you shall pay is a party issue but whether our sons shall accept a call of war in defense of foreign boundaries is not a party issue? I repeat, we can not play the game upon so low a plane.

It is true that this may lead to a realignment. That might be a blessing to our country. A false issue has too long divided the South and the North. Let the Mason and Dixon line disappear before the burning issues of the salvation of our common country. The North and South may have different views

over domestic questions. But in loyalty to our institutions and devotion to our independence geography does not divide our people. Let us stop finessing. Let men line up. Let those who believe that the American people should continue independent and free to control their own affairs according to their own wisdom and judgment stand upon one side and those who believe that we should transfer some of our most vital powers to a supergovernment controlled by foreigners stand upon the other. Let those who continue to adhere to the policy of Washington and Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln stand upon one side and those who would surrender our traditions, our teachings, and our policies to the interpretation, construction, and enforcement of European alliances stand upon the other. Yes, indeed, there will be party division.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns I want to do justice to Mr. Polk, of the State Department, and I desire to do it in the presence of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Earlier in the day the Senator from Massachusetts said:

I only know they—

Meaning copies of the treaty—

are here in this country and, on the authority of the State Department, that they are in the hands of the financial interests. That is not my statement. Now, Mr. President, that is all I could suggest to any committee.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator state who in the State Department made that statement, and to whom it was made?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Frank Polk made it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. To whom?

Mr. LODGE. He made it to the press, and it was printed in the press that evening.

I have taken the trouble to ascertain where it was printed, and so far as I am able to ascertain there was no publication anywhere concerning a statement by Mr. Polk, except in the Washington Star. I will read that portion of it which seems to refer to this matter. The article was written by Mr. Oliver Owen Kuhn. It does not purport to give a quotation from Mr. Polk, but is an allegation by Mr. Kuhn. It states:

It is admitted by the State Department that separate sections of the treaty, notably the financial and economic clauses, have fallen into hands of others than the department, but the department says it is not apprised of the reported fact that still other interests, notably the New York group of international financiers, have the document in full.

Other than State Department copies of the document, the only complete text that has been received in Washington, so far as known by the department, is that received by the Japanese Embassy, which copy, the department has been assured, was forwarded on to Tokio.

Investigation of just how the treaty fell into the hands of the New York financiers could be made, but the department here fails to indicate that it will take any steps in this direction. It is certain, however, that the treaty has not been transmitted to outside interests in America other than by mail or by person. Senator Lodge charges that the treaty came from attachés of the American commission to negotiate peace. The department in Washington declares that it is so far removed from the scene of negotiations that it can not affirm or deny.

Mr. President, that is rather a different statement from that which the Senator from Massachusetts averred. I took occasion immediately after his statement to call up Mr. Polk over the telephone, and he declared positively that he had not made the statement attributed to him by the Senator from Massachusetts, and that the only thing he had said was, referring to the statement of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] on the floor of the Senate, that it might be true, but he had no means of knowing whether it was true or not. I say this in justice to Mr. Polk.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the statement in the Star to which the Senator from Nebraska refers and of which he has read a portion says:

This may be said to summarize the State Department's answer to the charges made by both Mr. Lodge, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and his party cohort, Mr. BORAH.

I do not exactly know what "a party cohort" is.

Mr. President, on the day on which the first discussion about the presence of the treaty in this country arose, after the adjournment, as I was going to my office, I was met by a reporter of the Associated Press, who stopped me and said, "the State Department says that what you saw were fragments or extracts of the treaty in the hands of some New York business firm." I asked, "What did I say in the Senate?" He replied, "that you had seen the whole treaty." I said, "I am not in the habit of deliberately lying in public or private; I did see the whole treaty." The inquiry from this reporter who had just come from the State Department annoyed me a good deal, and I called up Mr. Polk on the telephone then and there. He said the reporter had misunderstood him; that, of course, he had not intended to question any statement I had made; and that all he had said was that he thought what had been referred to might be portions of the treaty relating to financial matters which had fallen into the hands of New York bankers or business men, whoever they were. That was the statement on which I acted.

I certainly meant to do no injustice to Mr. Polk, of whom I have the highest opinion, but he told me himself that he had made the statement of the character to which I have referred to the reporter.

I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 6, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, June 5, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father in heaven, we come to Thee with all the accumulated faith of the past, assured by the faith resident in our souls, seeking wisdom, strength, and courage from the source of all that is reliable.

We only know a little. Thou art infinite. Inspire us to the right and hold our course onward and upward, that out of all the confused conditions which surround us in the physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual life we may fulfill the highest and best conditions. Through Him who taught us by word and example how to live together in peace and harmony. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, the roll call in yesterday's RECORD shows that I was absent. I desire to say that I accompanied Gov. Robinson, of Oklahoma, his staff, and members of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress to New York for the purpose of welcoming home the Oklahoma soldiers of the Thirty-sixth Division. I also wish to say that if I had been present, I would have voted for the Agricultural bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement is out of order.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] asks leave of absence for three days on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

EMPLOYEES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and move to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department from further consideration of House resolution 66, and that it be called up for immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the Committee on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department be discharged from further consideration of resolution 66, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 66.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the Department of Agriculture who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month, respectively, received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above the salary received by the Government employees in said department.

To direct the attention of said department more fully to the particular information requested, reference is made to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I understand that such a motion is not debatable, and I therefore move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Debate is not in order on the motion to discharge the committee. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to discharge the committee.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 71 ayes and 5 noes.

So the motion to discharge the committee was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And that motion is debatable?

The SPEAKER. That question is debatable.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I presume the purpose of the gentleman is to ascertain whether there are employed in the Department of Agriculture persons who hold dual positions?

Mr. BLANTON. That is my purpose. I understand that there are, and in every other department of the Government, existing for years.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In the second paragraph the resolution provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit the names of all employees, and so forth, in the employ of the Government. How could the Secretary of Agriculture make a report as to all employees of the Government?

Mr. BLANTON. Any employees of the Government in his department.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I submit that there should be an amendment, because the Secretary of Agriculture would have no general jurisdiction such as is indicated here.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is mistaken about that. For instance, the question is as to the report of the names of all the employees in his department who have relatives in other departments of the Government. That is the purpose of section 2. It does not relate entirely to employees in the Agricultural Department.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am afraid the gentleman's resolution will defeat itself if it passes in this form. He should say "in the Department of Agriculture." If he would strike out "Government" and insert "Department of Agriculture," he would cover the situation. I question whether the resolution might not go so far as to relieve the Secretary of Agriculture from making any report at all.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on line 11, after the word "employees," there be inserted the words "in the Department of Agriculture."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves to amend by inserting after the word "employees," in line 11, the words "in the Department of Agriculture."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Has the gentleman any idea as to what the expense of this will be?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; it will not put the Government to the expense of more than \$150 for printing a certain questionnaire, which I will give to each one of these departments, and in fact have already sent them out to some of them; that is, if my questionnaire is used.

Mr. LITTLE. Will not some clerks have to be employed in the matter?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no. As far as that is concerned, I take it that most of these questionnaires will be delivered to the joint congressional commission which now has the matter under investigation. Anyway each department now has sufficient clerks to handle it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Since there will be no opportunity for amendment, I suggest these things to the gentleman: I think the word "promptly" is superfluous in line 2, because the resolution provides further on that the report shall be made at the earliest date possible. Then, I think the word "also" should be added at the end of line 6—

various branches of the Department of Agriculture who are also employed by any person, firm, or corporation.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the word "promptly" should remain there, because the earliest date practicable to some people means 6 months or 12 months or 18 months, and we ought to give the department to understand that we want these reports just as soon as they may be had.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I withdraw the suggestion as to that. It is a matter of tautology only. I think the word "also" should be inserted at the end of line 6—

the names of all Government employees in the various branches of the Department of Agriculture who are also employed—

And so forth.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by inserting the word "also" after the word "are," at the end of line 6, page 1.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, at the end of the line insert the word "also."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under section 2 of this resolution the Secretary of Agriculture is required to report all those employees in his department who have any relatives employed in his or in other departments. The gentleman knows that there are no records in the Department of Agriculture showing that fact, and the only way that the Secretary of Agriculture can obtain that information is to call before him every employee of the department and ask that employee whether he or she has relatives in any other department of the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no. If the gentleman will read section 3, or rather the end of the resolution, he will see that a proper method is pointed out, suggested to every one of the heads of these departments, whereby they may easily ascertain everything that we ask of them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is House joint resolution No. 5 the one introduced by the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. What information does that convey to the Department of Agriculture that would enable the head of that department to answer this question?

Mr. BLANTON. If they will submit that form of questionnaire proposed by me in House joint resolution No. 5, which can be done very easily, to each employee in the department, within 24 hours that department can have the answers to every question asked.

Mr. BARKLEY. Section 3 of the resolution provides that the Secretary of Agriculture must report not only these other things that have been mentioned, but he must carry on a census among the employees of the Department of Agriculture to find out how much income they have over and above their salaries in the department.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no. If he will submit my proposed questionnaire to them, which they can answer in 24 hours, he can have all of this information at his finger ends ready to give it to Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. What valuable purpose does the gentleman expect to serve in having Congress provided with the amount of income of each employee of the Department of Agriculture over and above his salary?

Mr. BLANTON. I am very glad the gentleman has asked me that, and I will explain it so that he can easily understand it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will ask the gentleman to make it very plain.

Mr. BLANTON. I stated on the floor of the House the other day that down in the Bureau of Mines, as chief chemist of that department, Mr. Charles L. Parsons was paid by the Government \$4,800 a year, and in that same department Mr. Parsons, although an employee of the Government, although he was expected to give the seven hours a day, from 9 a. m. until 5 p. m., to this Government, although this Government was paying him for the brain that he is supposed to use for the Government in those seven hours of work a day, has had housed in that department as an officer of a private corporation the American Chemical Society, with its corps of clerks in there, and which had no connection with this Government—a corps of clerks and employees which are not connected with the Government in any way whatever, he receiving an extra salary of \$3,500 from this corporation. And last year from 13,500 members of that private corporation he collected in a department of this Government \$137,000, that went into the coffers of this institution; that this institution has been getting its rent free from the Government; that it has been getting its janitor service free; that it has been getting its ice water and electric lights and fans free; and that the only time Mr. Parsons has to give to the private corporation is the time that was supposed to have been given to this Government, from 9 a. m. until 5 p. m., because no employee of this private corporation could remain in that building after 5 o'clock p. m.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Not yet. I want to fully answer the gentleman, so that he will understand it. [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I think I clearly understand as to that one man. The question I desire to ask is this: Admitting that the information with reference to this employee would be of value to the Congress, under the terms of the gentleman's resolution the Secretary of Agriculture is required to report whether any employee in his department has a house in Washington, we will say, or somewhere else, which rents for so much a month, and that that is a part of his income over and above his salary.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes it does.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman must let me answer him. A few weeks ago an employee of this Government, a Mr. Gallup, who had been in the employ of the Government for years as a clerk, died. I am reliably informed that his administrator reports that that clerk left an estate of about \$187,000 of District securities, money loaned in this District on first-mortgage liens.

He further reported that this clerk in the department left \$34,000 of securities in his hands, as good as Government bonds, that could be taken down here to a bank and cashed any day. When clerks are coming before this Congress like they will be doing in a few days, clamoring for an increase of bonus, when Congress has already increased their bonus first to \$120, when Congress, on further demand and further insistence, has increased their bonus to \$240, when we could not give our good soldiers who have come back from France and Flanders but a little \$60 bonus; when, as I say, they will be coming in here in a few days asking us to give them more bonus, when, if this resolution is answered properly—and I pointed out the proper way for it to be answered—it will be shown to this Congress that some of these clerks at least have more money than almost any other financial institution in this District; that they have piled it up year after year. Some of them have money loaned to banks, I understand. They are going to come here and ask us to raise their bonus. Some of them may need a bonus, some of them may need an increase of salary, but why not give it to the ones needing it and not make it a blanket raise; do not make it a blanket raise to the inefficient as well as the efficient; do not give it to the particular clerks down here in the Finance Division of the War Department who, when they were asked to work two or three hours' extra time more speedily to mail out this \$60 bonus to our deserving soldier boys, struck against the Government and walked out and said, "To hell with the soldiers' bonuses; we will not work over the time prescribed by Congress, seven hours."

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would like to state that the gentleman has not made it very plain why every employee of the United States should be put through a "third-degree" operation to find if they have some income above their salaries.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I have made it plain to every person in this House except my good friend from Kentucky. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman overestimates his clarity of statement.

Mr. GARRETT. I note the gentleman has three matters of inquiry. One of them refers to the question of their employment besides Government employment.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. I see no objection to that. The other is to get the names of relatives of those who are employed in other departments. I do not see any particular harm about that, but I want to ask the gentleman from Texas if he does not think he is going too far when he undertakes to ascertain and have reported to this House the income other than the income that is derived from their employment. The gentleman here would have reported the income derived from investments. In other words, he is delving into the private affairs of these people in a way that does not seem to me the Congress is justified in doing.

Mr. BLANTON. Just a moment.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

Mr. BLANTON. Let me first answer the two gentlemen, the one from Kentucky and the one from Tennessee. I assumed that inquiry was a proper one by answering it. It is a proper one. What right have we to look into the private income of individuals employed by this Government? We have just this right: If they were demanding merely a salary, that would be all right, but it is not merely a salary they demand, but they come in here each term of Congress and each session of Congress and each piece of session and demand in addition to the salary an extra bonus paid to every one of them in a blanket raise.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. BLANTON. Just a moment. If these people are getting salaries that will not pay expenses, if these people are getting salaries that will not pay house rent and grocery bills and dry goods bills and telephone bills and all of the incidental expenses that come to a family and a household, then they have got the right to ask for a blanket bonus of \$360, which they are going to do in a few days, but if there is a clerk like Mr. Gallup, who has got \$187,000 loaned out in District securities, I would ask if you are not concerned in knowing that fact when you grant a man in that financial situation a \$360 bonus when you sat here

and reduced the bonus to your soldier boys down to a little measly \$60.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest this to the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman's third provision is:

The amount of annual income, if any, over and above the salary received by the Government employees in said department.

Probably we would have no right to pass that anyway. The policy of the Government in reference to the collection of taxes on incomes forbids anybody in the Internal Revenue Bureau or the Treasury Department from divulging the amount of the income of any person who has to make a return or information found on the return. It would be contravening both the policy and the statute of the Government to direct the Secretary of Agriculture or even the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to ascertain and make public such income by a simple House resolution. It would require a joint resolution of the two Houses to be signed by the President, which would be practically repealing that portion of the law.

I think the gentleman from Texas, in view of that, should be willing to strike out section 3. It serves no useful purpose which the gentleman has in mind.

I agree with the gentleman from Texas, and also as expressed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], that the first and second paragraphs or sections are all right, and that there is no objection to them, but if I were the gentleman I would strike out section 3.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, of course, knows more about the rules of the House and the law than I do. I certainly admit that, but I want to call the gentleman's attention to the rulings under Rule XXII, under which I have called up this resolution. He will find that back for 100 years this House has ruled that it has the right, through resolutions, to call on any department of Government at any time for any kind of information that exists in that department that will aid the membership of the House in passing upon questions which may come before it for consideration.

Mr. KITCHIN. But if there is a law against it—

Mr. BLANTON. If there is a law against it. But if it is a ruling—

Mr. KITCHIN. It is no ruling. It is the law. If the Secretary of Agriculture desired to find out what the exact return is in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, he could go there, but when the Secretary of Agriculture goes there to find out the commissioner would say, "You can not get that."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, the law referred to by the gentleman from North Carolina merely relates to the Internal Revenue Department giving out information to the public. It has nothing in the world to do with the question of the House of Representatives calling on the department of Government for information that exists in that department.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the better judgment of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] propounds a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. I want to know when is the proper time to offer an amendment to strike out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has the floor. That can be done when he yields the floor.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the better judgment of the older men in Congress on this question, and I move that section 3 be stricken from this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] moves that section 3 be stricken from the resolution.

Mr. GARD. A parliamentary inquiry. Does the gentleman move that or ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves it. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, under the same section of the rule I move that the committee be discharged from further consideration of House resolution No. 65.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor be discharged from further consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 65.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Labor be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the Labor Department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers, are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month respectively received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above their Government salary received by the Government employees in said department.

Attention is directed to the form of questionnaire in House joint resolution 5, as one calculated to elicit the information sought.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I move, Mr. Speaker, first, that the vote by which the former resolution was agreed to be reconsidered and that motion laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is too late. This motion is now pending. The question is on discharging the committee, as moved by the gentleman.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, now I move that the vote by which the former resolution was passed be reconsidered and that the motion be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will wait until we dispose of this.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the same amendments which were made to the preceding resolution be considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that section 3 of House resolution No. 65 be stricken out.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will modify his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the same amendment—

The SPEAKER. The Chair put the unanimous consent that the gentleman asks, that section 3 be stricken out.

Mr. BLANTON. There were some other amendments besides the one to section 3.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will submit the amendments and have them reported by the Clerk.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the following amendment, that—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. You do not require the amendment to section 1. That is all right in this instance.

Mr. BLANTON. I move that on line 10, after the word "employees," there be added "in the Department of Labor."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, namely, that section 3 be stricken out, with the understanding, however, that section 3 embraces only the three lines 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. GARRETT. That other ought to go out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 2.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by striking out, in addition to that, lines 4, 5, and 6.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not yield the floor.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman loses the floor when he offers an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike it all out.

Mr. GARD. There is not any motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to strike out all of section 3, from lines 1 to 6, on page 2, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider also the vote by which resolution No. 66 was agreed to was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department be discharged from further consideration of House resolution No. 67.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department be discharged from the further consideration of House resolution No. 67, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 67.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the Interior Department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers, are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month respectively received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above their Government salary, received by the Government employees in said department.

Attention is directed to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5 as one calculated to elicit the information sought.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment. On line 11, after the word "employees," insert the words "in the Department of the Interior."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Amend, page 1, line 11, by inserting, after the word "employees," the words "in the Department of the Interior."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield in a moment. Now, Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment: To strike out all of section 3, lines 1 to 6, on page 2, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a further amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Amend, page 2, by striking out all of lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

Mr. BLANTON. Now I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. BLACK. I want to know what useful purpose the gentleman expects to accomplish by requiring the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Agriculture to find out how many brothers a man may have in the service, or how many sisters he may have? In what way would that affect the compensation or the merits of it?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I think I can answer the gentleman to his entire satisfaction.

Mr. BLACK. Or the substance of his employment.

Mr. BLANTON. Since I introduced a resolution here the other day to appoint an auditor to audit the accounts and expenditures in the United States Employment Service I understand that there has been dismissed from that service within the last few days quite a score of employees on big salaries, including the sister of the director of that department, who last July carried a book in her pocket which authorized her to go to any railroad station in the United States and sign up a slip and call for transportation. She used that book in New York on the 4th day of last July to get transportation and Pullman service for three different people from New York to Atlantic City, and on the 7th day of July transportation and Pullman service for herself from Atlantic City back to New York. That is a practice that I want to break up in this Government. [Applause on the Republican side.] And I want to say that in breaking it up I am just as loyal a Democrat as there is on the floor of this House. [Applause.]

I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, that this system at which I am aiming these resolutions right now is not a Democratic system. It is a vicious system, as I said the other day, which

we Democrats inherited from our good brothers on the Republican side six years ago. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Has that answered the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BLACK. That is not to my mind a satisfactory answer, to require the heads of these departments to find out how many brothers and sisters and mothers and fathers an employee may have that are employed by the Government. It seems to me, if the gentleman wants to find out whether we have any useless employees in the Government service, he is not going about it in the right way. I do not think the second paragraph of your resolution will serve any useful purpose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Densmore has the right to employ his sister. Other members or officials of that Labor Department have the right to employ their wives, if they can give just as good service as anybody else. But when they get to riding around over this country on Government transportation, if you please, from Washington to the California coast, and from New York to Atlantic City, and to the various other watering places of this country in the summer months, I want to know it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman answer this question?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. BLACK. Will the answers to these inquiries that you propose to propound disclose any information of that sort?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; they will.

Mr. BLACK. In what way?

Mr. BLANTON. Because I have had good auditors promise me that when these departments call upon them they are going to give the evidence, and they are not afraid to do it. [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BLANTON. Gladly.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman is doubtless aware of the fact that there was created in the last Congress, and appointed in part by the Speaker, a joint congressional committee for the investigation of the salaries in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I am aware of that. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARD. What purpose not embraced within the purview of the employment of such a committee as that is contained in the gentleman's request for information from these departments?

Mr. BLANTON. It is to bring out evidence that is covered by no part of the questionnaire prepared by this joint congressional committee. One member of that committee has made speech after speech in Washington, at banquets and meetings of the employees of this Government, saying, "Don't be afraid of us, boys; we are not going to hurt you, but we are going to help you." [Laughter on Republican side.] I have tried my best to get that joint congressional committee to prepare a questionnaire that will elicit the information that I want to know, as one new Member of Congress, when I pass upon the reclassification of salaries.

Mr. GARD. Would it not be better for the gentleman to save the condemnation until this joint legislative committee can make its report?

Mr. BLANTON. I am saving it. If you just knew all I have got in my pocket you would think I am saving it. [Laughter.] Does the gentleman want to ask me any further questions? [Laughter.]

Mr. GARD. It is not a matter of saving it. It is a matter of saving your condemnation until you see what this committee appointed for this purpose is going to do.

Mr. BLANTON. My good friend, who has occupied the bench, well knows that a judge upon the bench does not pass judgment until the culprit comes before him in the court, and then he passes his condemnation.

Mr. GARD. Whom does the gentleman call the culprit, the joint legislative committee or the clerk in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BLANTON. I say it with due deliberation that when this House appoints a joint congressional committee to bring us evidence that we are to use in passing upon the reclassification of salaries, when that joint congressional committee are spending thousands of dollars of the people's money in doing it, they ought to bring us information that is worth something.

Mr. GARD. Possibly they will. How does the gentleman know they are not going to do that?

Mr. BLANTON. They have not asked a question of a man or woman or child in this District that would elicit the information whether or not employees are working for private concerns

or private individuals or private corporations, and giving more of their time on the outside than they are giving to this Government.

Mr. GARD. That is a difference of opinion between those who compose this joint legislative committee and the gentleman; but in all good faith to this committee, which the gentleman voted for, the House members of which themselves distinguished former Members of this House, were appointed by the honored former Speaker of this House, ought we not in all fairness to wait in our condemnation at least until the evidence is before us and not go off upon any assumption or wild ideas that something is going to happen that may not happen at all? In other words, I want to voice my confidence in this joint congressional committee until I know they have abused that confidence. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the gentleman from Ohio is a fair and judicial one. All I am trying to do by these resolutions is to bring before this Congress evidence that will not be elicited by the questionnaires which have already been prepared by the joint congressional committee, and which have already been answered by every one of these employees of this Government, which evidence is now being compiled into a voluminous record that will probably cost thousands of dollars to print and put on our desks and into the pages of which many of us will never look—

Mr. GARD. I presume the gentleman from Texas will look into it.

Mr. BLANTON. I will look into it, I promise you, but I want to obtain the evidence that they fail to obtain. Their evidence is all in. So far as they are concerned, the case is closed, and I want to bring additional evidence here, because, fortunately, my good colleagues, you and I are the ones who are to pass upon their report and upon the reclassification of salaries. This joint congressional committee is merely a creature of this House. It is merely a servant of this House, to help gather information here for our guidance. If they do not prepare to bring all the evidence we want, we have the right to take steps to obtain the balance for ourselves. I do not know whether my good friend from Ohio [Mr. GARD] would be interested in this additional evidence or not, but I promise you I will be interested in it.

Mr. GARD. I shall be quite as much interested as the gentleman is.

Mr. BLANTON. If he inspects it with that clear, judicial mind of his, when he comes to make up his conclusions he will be glad that a new Member helped him to get this information.

Mr. GARD. The difference between the gentleman and myself is that I am not explosively premature. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Well, there is something in that. I might tell my good friend a joke on myself in that connection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Tell the joke.

Mr. BLANTON. I was going down to one of the departments not long ago with Senator SHEPPARD, who, in my judgment, is one of the greatest men who legislate in this Capitol to-day.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Turn around, so we can hear you.

Mr. BLANTON. I am talking to my good Democratic friends now. There happened to be a tennis racket in the automobile, and I said to Senator SHEPPARD, "That is one of the greatest games that we have in this country to-day." He said, "Why?" I said, "It teaches you the three great essentials in life." He said, "What are they?" I said, "It teaches you, first, to see quickly and to see correctly, and then it teaches you, second, to think quickly and think correctly, and, thirdly, it teaches you to act quickly and act correctly." The Senator said, "Oh, golf has got it skinned a city block. Golf teaches you the great essential." I said, "What is that, Senator?" He said, "It teaches you how to act deliberately." And that is the joke on me in connection with the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD]. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARD. I commend to the gentleman from Texas the teachings of that ancient and honorable Scotch game. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the gentleman from Texas has permitted himself to be slightly misled probably by the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] with reference to the "congressional committee." I know of no committee of that kind which performs the work that has been spoken of. The committee that corresponds the nearest to that is one which was indeed authorized by Congress, but one appointed by the President and not a joint congressional committee.

Mr. BLANTON. It is a joint congressional commission, and I want to say that the members of it are my friends, and I consider them so, and I would not say a word to even hurt the feelings of one of them. Two of them have been very kind to me. One of them came to my office and discussed the matter

with me. One of them wrote me. The gentleman from Missouri came to my office and discussed it quite at length with me, but could not promise that he could do anything for me in getting my proposed questionnaire submitted. I want to say I have perfect confidence in the great Democratic leader on this side of the House, Mr. CHAMP CLARK. I consider him one of the great men of this country, and I am willing to follow him in his splendid leadership here. I am not casting any aspersions on his appointees, but he is human, the same as everybody else. If he was not human he would not be sitting in this bunch of fellows now. [Laughter and applause.] Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES IN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department from further consideration of House resolution 68.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 68.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the Navy Department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers, are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month respectively received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above their Government salary, received by the Government employees in said department.

Attention is directed to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5 as one calculated to elicit the information sought.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to discharge the committee.

The motion to discharge the committee was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment:

On page 1, line 11, after the word "employees," insert the words "in the Navy Department."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees," insert the words "in the Navy Department."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, strike out all of section 3, including the lines 1 to 6.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out section 3 and insert in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 3. That the Clerk of this House do report to the House what Members have their sons or their relatives as clerks, and the ages and accomplishments of said relatives."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to accept that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the amendment as amended by the substitute.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice be discharged from further consideration of House resolution 69.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.
The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 69.

Resolved, That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the Department of Justice who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers, are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month, respectively, received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above their Government salary, received by the Government employees in said department.

Attention is directed to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5 as one calculated to elicit the information sought.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to discharge the committee.

The motion to discharge the committee was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina who offered a substitute amendment a few moments ago, I want to state to that good gentleman that I do not know who is his secretary.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, what is before the House.

The SPEAKER. The resolution to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice and adopt the resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. I move the previous question on the motion to discharge the committee.

The SPEAKER. That has been agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say to the gentleman from South Carolina that I do not know who occupies the position of his secretary, but I want him to know, and I want every other man in the House to know, that the man who sits in my office as my secretary and draws \$2,000 from this Government came here from Texas in order to accept the position with me in Washington; that he gave up a position of general superintendent of one of the biggest firms in Galveston, Tex.—Clarke & Courts—known from one side of Texas to the other. He gave up a position that paid him \$2,400. He had under him over 100 men that he supervised; and that is the kind of talent I am giving to the people of my district on a salary of \$2,000 a year as one of the employees of my office.

Mr. STEVENSON. I introduced the resolution in order that all the righteousness might come out at one time. If that disturbs the gentleman from Texas, I regret it, but what I would like to know is how Thomas L. Blanton, jr., occupies the position on the clerks' roll as clerk to THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Texas, as he did last year, and also if he did not have a son on the roll as a page. The gentleman says he does not know who my secretary is, and he says that his secretary gave up a \$2,400 position. I will say to the gentleman that my secretary is Eugene Hutchinson, of Rock Hill, S. C., a man 35 years old, whom I have paid \$2,400 ever since he has been here. He is a good clerk, and the gentleman will not find in any investigation that I have been dividing the salary with him either.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I was sure of that when he offered the amendment.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I will not yield further now.

Mr. STEVENSON. I did not think so.

Mr. BLANTON. Because we have appropriation bills to consider. Oh, I yield, if the gentleman has anything that he wants to get rid of.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman stated that he was sure of that when I offered the amendment. I would like to know if the gentleman is merely playing with the House and asking questions by means of resolutions and also asking questions of Members merely for the purpose of hearing himself talk? I am becoming impressed that that is what he is doing. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, if I am playing with the House, I want the gentleman to know that the House is sitting here willing to be played with.

Mr. STEVENSON. The House is suffering a good deal.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman asked me why there appeared upon the roll the name of my son as my secretary. Evidently the gentleman has not been attending the sessions of this House. Evidently the gentleman does not read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because it was stated upon the floor of this House during the last Congress, when that question was raised by my economic friend from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], and it was put into the RECORD by affidavits, sworn to before a notary public, that the name of my son was placed on that roll in order to

control the \$2,000 salary, so that I could provide an efficient office force; that from time to time I had had as many as three and four different employees in my office; and I want to state for the benefit of my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] that ever since this Congress adjourned, when lots of you good friends of mine were off on your vacations, deserved as they were, because we had been working very hard, I spent from 12 to 16 hours in my office almost every day and night since the adjournment of Congress. I have had a day shift and a night shift. [Applause.] And I have paid as high as \$100 a month out of my pocket for clerk hire.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I decline to yield, because I want to get through here, so that we may go on with the appropriation bills.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BLANTON. I decline to yield. I move the previous question on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I will not.

Mr. STEVENSON. What is the name of the gentleman's secretary that he says he has now?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed and to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, have the amendments been incorporated in this resolution? If not, I would like to offer them myself.

The SPEAKER. They have not been.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, that has been overlooked. I ask unanimous consent to consider these amendments.

The SPEAKER. It is too late to offer amendments except by unanimous consent.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendment may be considered as a part of the resolution. On line 11, page 1, after the word "employees," add the words "in the Department of Justice."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that there may be incorporated the amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees," insert the words "in the Department of Justice."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that section 3 of the resolution be eliminated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that section 3 of the resolution be eliminated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I now move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to and to lay that on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

EMPLOYEES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department may be discharged from further consideration of House resolution 70.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves to discharge the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department from further consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 70.

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the Post Office Department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers, are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month respectively received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above the salary received by the Government employees in said department.

To direct the attention of said department more fully to the particular information requested, reference is made to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5.

The SPEAKER. The question is on discharging the committee from further consideration of the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, on page 1, line 10, by inserting the words "in the Post Office Department" after the word "employees."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "employees," insert the words "in the Post Office Department."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, on page 2, by striking out section 3.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, strike out all of lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, there was one question asked by my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON], which inadvertently I did not answer. He is entitled to an answer. He asked me why it was that I had a son who was a page boy in the House of Representatives.

Mr. STEVENSON. Oh, no; I did not ask any such question.

Mr. BLANTON. What did the gentleman ask?

Mr. STEVENSON. I stated that the gentleman had a son who was a page in the House of Representatives last year. I did not ask any question. I also stated that he has a son whose name is now on the roll as his clerk. I did not ask the gentleman any question about it.

Mr. BLANTON. He has a right to have an answer to that inquiry. Under the old custom, the good old Republican custom, which has prevailed here in Washington back to a time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, the party in power has the distribution of certain patronage. When I reached here two years ago, a new man from west Texas, I was told that I had a position of page in the House of Representatives at my disposal.

I spoke to my people in my home town shortly afterwards, to a big audience of them, and I said: "People, I have at my disposal in Washington the position of page. It is considered by some men"—possibly by the gentleman from South Carolina—"as an insignificant position, but I consider it an honorable position. I would like for one of your west Texas boys to occupy it. You can not afford to send your boy up there; but if you can and want to do it, I will promise any man here if he will send his boy there I will appoint him page in the House of Representatives; but if you can not send your boy I will consider it an honor for my boy to sit in the House of Representatives at the knee of CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri."

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. And my people—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. In a minute I will yield. I will yield to my good friend—

Mr. BANKHEAD. It really would be in the nature of a parliamentary inquiry, but probably that would not be parliamentary. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Texas is not discussing the resolution.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of a semblance of order I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has the floor.

Mr. BLANTON. I have the floor, and I am going to get through in just about a minute. I told my people—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a ruling.

The SPEAKER. The Chair really was not listening to the gentleman from Texas, he regrets to say. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Under those circumstances I will not insist on a ruling.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, although the distinguished Speaker was not listening to me, evidently I had the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama. [Laughter.] I told my people that if they did not want me to have my son as a page or their son as a page, there would be enough Republican boys here to act as page, but I preferred to give it to a Democratic boy from west Texas—

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I do.

Mr. CARTER. Did I understand the gentleman to say earlier in his remarks that he told his people that they could not afford to send their boys here to Washington to take the place?

Mr. BLANTON. I said they could not afford to do it. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARTER. That is what I wanted to get in the RECORD.

Mr. BLANTON. I told them—

Mr. CARTER. That is prior to the time you told them you were going to appoint your son. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. The remark of my distinguished friend from Oklahoma is very facetious. It remains the fact I had the express permission of my people, and I want to say now if any good Republican friend of mine will give me his page patronage I will put my little son back here, because I am willing for him to associate with this splendid body of men, even though he does have to look into the countenance of my good friend from Alabama occasionally. [Laughter.] I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw that and offer an amendment. In line 10—no; the amendments have been agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution as amended.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Has the amendment been offered in line 11?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk reports to the Chair that the amendments have been offered and agreed to. The question is on the resolution as amended.

The question was taken, and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

On a motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES IN THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of House resolution 71.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield, because we are wasting time. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the gentleman ought to allow the House to have a statement from our committee about this.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not yield; debate is not in order.

Mr. BLANTON. I can not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from further consideration of resolution 71, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 71.

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and it is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees of said department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers, are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month, respectively, received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above the salary received by the Government employees in said department.

To direct the attention of said department more fully to the particular information requested, reference is made to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5.

The SPEAKER. The question is on discharging the committee.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in justice to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I want to say that this committee reported to me this morning that they would like to take this matter up and consider it later on and be willing to give me a hearing on it, but in view of the fact that this resolution is so simple that it can be easily understood by anyone by reading it the first time I do not consider that a hearing is necessary on it, and I would consider it a waste of time to have a hearing on it; and in view of the fact we are passing upon similar resolutions at this time, I do not care to hold this resolution up, and, therefore, I offer the following amendment:

In line 11, page 1, after the word "employees," insert "in the Interstate Commerce Commission."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees," insert the words "in the Interstate Commerce Commission."

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire just five minutes to discuss this matter in connection with the lecture which I received a few minutes ago, and lest I might be considered as not speaking strictly to the motion, I will ask permission to proceed either in or out of order for five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I will agree to the gentleman proceeding in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] asks permission to speak for five minutes, not pertinent to the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak anyway in reference to the statement which the gentleman made, in which he misconstrued my position about there being relatives embraced in the employees. The gentleman is calling upon the departments here to require employees to state what relatives they have in any of the departments. Now, those employees are mere clerks, the subject of executive appointment and subject to removal. They are under the power of the heads of the departments and have no power to name a relative that goes into some other department, and, therefore, if there is any blame attached to their relatives being in other departments it can not be laid upon the innocent clerk who is in a department and has a relative somewhere else.

The gentleman says that I seem to be rather inclined to look upon the office of page as insignificant. Oh, no; I do not. I was told that I had one to my credit, but when I tried to get the place I found the son of Mr. BLANTON and the son of everybody else as pages. I had not any son, and I never got the appointment of any page. The point I make is, if it is wrong for a clerk in a department to have a brother or son or an uncle or an aunt in another department or in that particular department, where they are appointed by a responsible head, it is wrong for a man who is connected with the Government and has the power to appoint a subordinate to name his near relative to perform that work. [Applause.] Therefore I asked for this information, and if the gentleman does not like it I can not help it.

I will state also, Mr. Speaker, that at the last session, when my friend was after the clerks up yonder and talking about relatives, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] brought up the question, and he admitted that he had a 14-year-old boy on the roll as his clerk. And he has got him there to-day, and he admitted he got part of the pay.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not admit anything of the kind, and it is not so.

Mr. STEVENSON. The following is from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 14, 1918, page 3507:

Mr. Wood of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in the two minutes allotted me I desire to call the attention of the House to the inconsistency of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who is decrying the very small raise provided by this amendment to the employees of this Government. Mr. BLANTON is being fairly well paid for his services at \$7,500 a year. In addition to that he is receiving, as I am informed, more than \$700 mileage per session; also \$2,000 a year for a son who is a clerk in his office.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman would not want to make a misstatement. Mr. Wood of Indiana. What is your clerk's name?

Mr. BLANTON. My son is a clerk, but my son gets very little of that money. Mrs. R. L. Arceneaux is one of my clerks in my office, at \$1,200 a year, and from time to time I have had various other employees.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does not the gentleman think it comes in bad faith for a Member of Congress—

Mr. STEVENSON. I say that from a Member of Congress who by implication reflects on every employee of the Government who has a relative in any other department, it comes with bad grace to employ their own relatives to places subject to their appointment and designation, where they may draw money from Uncle Sam.

Now, my friend said that he asked his people from west Texas if they wanted to send a page or if he should put in his own son. I say, whom did he ask? There are a great many people in that district, which is 600 miles long. Did he talk by newspaper advertisement? Did he address a letter to each constituent who has a son, or did he say to one or two if they would not send their sons he would put his son in?

Mr. CARTER. I just wanted to say that I understood the gentleman from Texas to state that he called all of the people in his district in mass meeting and submitted this momentous question to them, and they told him they would not send their boys, and he then asked to send his son.

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] comes here and by implication reflects upon the name of every clerk in the department, because, forsooth, they have a

relative of some kind in some other department. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is unworthy of this Congress to make any such implication and then run away from the fact that some of their own clerks are their sons and especially while in the name of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is standing the name of Thomas L. Blanton, jr., on the record of the Clerk of the House down here as his clerk, and, unless I am mistaken, he is only 15 years old.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to discuss the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. I understood that the Chair recognized me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Gentlemen of the House, I sincerely hope that this resolution will not be adopted. On yesterday the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which this resolution was referred seven days ago, took official action to consider it and to invite Mr. BLANTON to come before it and testify with reference to it. Ever since this resolution was introduced and referred to our committee we have been holding hearings every day on the return of the telegraph and telephone wires of this country to their private owners. We have had no opportunity to consider this resolution, and at this particular time this resolution, above all those which have been brought in here, ought to be considered carefully.

Now, the Interstate Commerce Commission is not a political body. All their employees are under the civil service. They do not even control the appointment of their own clerks, except in making selections from the certified list furnished by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. That committee, by the action of the House just taken, has already been discharged, and the gentleman from Kentucky is, therefore, speaking out of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am speaking now, Mr. Speaker, on the motion for the adoption of this resolution, and I submit that is not out of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not out of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is not a body in the United States that is now busier than the Interstate Commerce Commission, as everybody in this House knows, and if you pass this resolution it will require that commission to appoint additional clerks to investigate, not only the employees in Washington but every employee of the Interstate Commerce Commission everywhere else in the United States, to find out whether they have any relatives, not alone in the employ of the Interstate Commerce Commission, but also in every other branch of the United States Government; and of all resolutions that ought not to be adopted at this time without full consideration of a committee, this one is the most unnecessary and foolish, placing a burden on the Interstate Commerce Commission. Therefore I hope this resolution will not be adopted. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, fortunately there is in the little room yonder evidence of every employee of this House in writing. Whatever clerks I have are set down in writing in a printed book in that little room.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman is in order.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not going to take up the time of the House on trivial matters. But, Mr. Speaker, I do want to say this, in answer to the gentleman, that I have heard from the time I was a small boy that when you put a coal of fire upon a terrapin's back you are going to get some action. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I decline to yield.

Mr. STEVENSON. All right. I will answer the gentleman later.

Mr. BLANTON. And I expected, Mr. Speaker, when I brought these resolutions in here, in order to get evidence before this House, that personal attacks would be made upon me by Members, but more especially from the other side of the House than this side. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNUTSON. You have been disappointed—

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I am a little disappointed. My coal of fire seems to be burning more Democrats than Republicans. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker, and offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. An amendment is pending. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees," insert the words "in the Interstate Commerce Commission."

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word in justice to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and its members. This resolution, which was sent to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, was brought up yesterday afternoon by its chairman [Mr. Esch]. That committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Esch, has been as busy as it could be without holding night sessions. We go there at 10 o'clock in the morning and stay there until the House meets, and take a recess and get back at 2 o'clock, and stay there as long as there is anything to do, which is as late as 5 o'clock almost every day.

Now, it has been utterly impossible to consider all that is before the committee, things of the very highest importance, as expeditiously as they ought to be considered and yet justify the name of "consideration." Mr. Esch brought this matter up before the committee yesterday afternoon, and kindly and courteously, I am satisfied—because that is the kind of a man he is—wrote Mr. BLANTON and asked him to come before the committee and explain the merits of the resolution and explain what he wanted and what facts he had that would justify the committee in making a favorable report on this resolution; and now, before it was possible for the committee to act, the gentleman from Texas moves to discharge the committee, apparently with the idea that it is willfully refusing to do its duty. The rule provides that all these resolutions shall be officially referred to committees, and if this committee is to be discharged from the consideration of this resolution at this time what was the use of referring it to the committee? I have respect for the committee, and I know it is the honest intention and purpose of the committee to hear Mr. BLANTON fully and also hear anybody else who has anything to say with reference to the resolution, and to report it, with or without amendment.

Now, this is the only one of the resolutions that I know anything about. The committee voted unanimously to treat Mr. BLANTON with all courtesy, and yet he comes in here and says the resolution is so simple that it is unnecessary for him to be heard by our committee. It seems to me the House is treating the matter too much in a spirit of levity and fun. What is the use in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee trying to hear evidence on the resolution, as it ought to be heard, if the House is going to arbitrarily discharge the committee when it had absolutely no time in which to consider it?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out section 3.

Mr. MONDELL. No reflection is involved to the effect that any committee of the House has not endeavored to take action. Under the rules the resolution is privileged after seven days. The committee could have acted without hearings if desired. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has the right to call his resolution up, and it is not necessarily a reflection on the committee when he does so.

Mr. SIMS. I admit that he is within his parliamentary rights. I did not mean that he was personally doing anything wrong. But what do we know about the merits of this resolution? There may be justification for this resolution, but I do think that the House ought not to discharge the committee from the consideration of the resolution when the committee is doing everything it can to consider it in a proper way. I think this kind of action will get us nowhere, and bring confusion and troubles to the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to suggest also that the committee took occasion to inquire of the Interstate Commerce Commission what it would cost to get this information that this resolution calls for, and that we have had no opportunity to get a reply from them.

Mr. SIMS. Certainly. We are trying to investigate it on its merits, and to treat the House as it ought to be treated, and to help the gentleman, as far as we can, to ascertain whether there is anything in it justifying the adoption of such a resolution. I think this resolution ought to be voted down, not on the ground

that there may not be merit in it, but on the ground that we do not know whether there is or not, that it is a dragnet which may run the Government and the commission into an expenditure of many thousands of dollars, and tie up this commission, by investigating facts as to who has kinfolks in that department or who is receiving some compensation on the outside.

Mr. REAVIS. The resolution calls for kinfolk in any Government department.

Mr. SIMS. That is all right, but nobody can tell how much expense it is going to involve, and before reporting this resolution we were trying to find out about how much expense there will be in getting the replies to this particular resolution according to its terms. It seems to me we ought to have time to do it, because this resolution is not a war emergency or any other kind of an emergency measure. While the gentleman is thoroughly within his parliamentary rights, I think the House ought not to accept the responsibility of acting on this kind of a matter without any information whatever when information is available and can be secured that will be a real guidance for the action of the Members of the House.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I move that section 3, on page 2, be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. There is an amendment already pending, the amendment in line 11, page 1. The question will first be taken on that.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. I move that, on page 2, section 3 be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, strike out all of lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

Mr. BLANTON. I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The amendment must first be voted upon.

Mr. BLANTON. All right.

Mr. STEVENSON. I desire to discuss this amendment for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina—

Mr. MONDELL. Did not the gentleman from Texas move the previous question?

The SPEAKER. He withdrew it.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I did not withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman move the previous question?

Mr. BLANTON. I do.

The SPEAKER. The Chair misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. STEVENSON. The stenographic report will show that the gentleman moved the previous question on the adoption of the resolution. That question is not before the House yet, and I do not think it is proper to shut off discussion here in an arbitrary way.

Mr. BLANTON. I have no disposition to shut the gentleman off.

Mr. STEVENSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to close all I have to say about the little lectures I have received from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. He closed with a very witty remark awhile ago that "when you put a coal on a terrapin's back you always see him move." Now, Mr. Speaker, he evidently referred to me. [Laughter.] Now, I have not voted against his resolution. I am the man who brought the coal in here, and this is the terrapin on whose back it got. [Indicating Mr. BLANTON]. The measure was passed, and up to that time the temperature of the gentleman was about the same as that of the ice water in this House, and in two or three minutes it was as hot as the branch water that we get over in the House Office Building, and he began to reply to me after he had accepted the amendment, after it had been adopted, and after we had passed another resolution. It struck him that that thing was beginning to burn him a little. It took about the right length of time for the coal to begin to heat through the shell of a terrapin, and he is the terrapin, and he is the one that got burned. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. STEVENSON. Wait a minute, Mr. Speaker. As this thing goes along, history grows. The gentleman is apparently denouncing clerks for having kinsfolk in the service of the Government, and since we discussed the fact that at the last session the gentleman was the father of a page in this House, and that he was and still is the father of a clerk in the shape of a 14-year-old boy, it comes out that, bless your soul, he had a clerk in the post office at the same time. Why, Mr. Speaker, he was getting to be

a monopoly. He was violating the Sherman Act, and he ought to have been dissolved by an order of the Supreme Court. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in final reply to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, I want to say that if there are any pernicious practices carried on in the House of Representatives I want the people of South Carolina to determine who is most responsible, their Representative who has been here for years and years or a new man from Texas who has been here only one term.

Mr. STEVENSON. If you want to submit that to the people of South Carolina, they will give you an answer very quickly, but I am not going to call a meeting to determine whether I shall have a page in the House or not. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to strike out section 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The question being taken on ordering the previous question, on a division (demanded by Mr. SIMS and Mr. BARKLEY) there were—ayes 112, noes 2.

Accordingly the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, upon that question I demand the yeas and nays. Then maybe they will quit monkeying with it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused, seven Members, not a sufficient number, seconding the demand.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 106, noes 55.

Accordingly the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of House resolution 72.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 72.

Resolved, That the Director General of the United States Railroad Administration be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the United States Railroad Administration who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers, are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month, respectively, received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above their Government salary received by the Government employees in said department.

Attention is directed to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5 as one calculated to illicit the information sought.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. There is no debate on the motion. The question is on the motion to discharge the committee.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 73, noes 49.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees," insert "in the official offices of the United States Railroad Administration."

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. What does the gentleman mean by "official offices"?

Mr. BLANTON. As distinguished from traffic employees.

Mr. SIMS. They have got "official offices" all over the United States, with officers that used to be in charge of the railroad as managed by private corporations. Every letterhead

announces that it is the United States Railroad Administration. There will be an immense amount of trouble and expense incurred under such a resolution as this.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, strike out section 3.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the passage of the resolution as amended.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point that no quorum is present, and evidently there is no quorum here.

Mr. SIMS. Was the question being taken on the previous question or on the passage of the resolution?

Mr. BLANTON. Let me say to the gentleman—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Chair having announced that there is no quorum here, are not gentlemen out of order?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is correct.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas made the point of no quorum and the call of the House follows automatically.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, the Chair had declared the motion for the previous question carried and started to announce that the question was on the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the gentleman is mistaken. The Chair said that the previous question was carried—

Mr. WINGO. And the Chair had started to make the statement that the question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the gentleman from Texas had risen in time to make the point of no quorum and that that was in order. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the previous question will say "aye" and those opposed will answer "no."

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 311, nays 8, answered "present" 3, not voting 107, as follows:

YEAS—311.

Ackerman	Cole	Garrett	Knutson
Alexander	Connally	Glynn	Kreider
Almon	Cooper	Godwin, N. C.	LaGuardia
Anderson	Cramton	Good	Lampert
Andrews, Md.	Crisp	Goodykoontz	Langley
Andrews, Nebr.	Crowther	Graham, Ill.	Lanham
Anthony	Cullen	Green, Iowa	Lankford
Ashbrook	Currie, Mich.	Greene, Mass.	Layton
Aswell	Dallinger	Grist	Lazaro
Baika	Darrow	Hadley	Lee, Calif.
Bacharach	Davis, Minn.	Hamilton	Lee, Ga.
Baer	Davis, Tenn.	Haskell	Leshner
Bankhead	Dickinson, Mo.	Hastings	Lever
Barkley	Dickinson, Iowa	Haugen	Little
Bee	Dominick	Hawley	Loneragan
Begg	Doremus	Hayden	Longworth
Bel	Dowell	Hays	Luce
Benham	Drane	Heflin	Lufkin
Black	Dunbar	Hernandez	Lubling
Black, Ind.	Dunn	Hersey	McAndrews
Bland, Mo.	Dupré	Hersman	McArthur
Bland, Va.	Dyer	Hickey	McClintic
Blanton	Eagle	Hoch	McCulloch
Boies	Edmonds	Holland	McDuffie
Booher	Elliott	Houghton	McGlennon
Bowers	Elston	Howard	McKeown
Box	Emerson	Huddleston	McKinley
Brand	Esch	Hudspeth	McKinley
Briggs	Evans, Mont.	Hulings	McLane
Brinson	Evans, Nebr.	Hull, Tenn.	McLaughlin, Mich.
Britten	Evans, Nev.	Husted	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Brooks, Ill.	Fairfield	Igoe	MacCrate
Brooks, Pa.	Ferris	Jacoway	MacGregor
Browning	Fess	Jefferis	Madden
Burdick	Fields	Johnson, Ky.	Magee
Burroughs	Fitzgerald	Johnson, Miss.	Maher
Byrnes, S. C.	Flood	Johnson, Wash.	Major
Candler	Focht	Johnston, N. Y.	Mansfield
Campbell, Kans.	Fordney	Jones, Pa.	Mapes
Carr	Foster	Jones, Tex.	Martin
Caraway	Frear	Jaul	Mays
Carss	Freeman	Kearns	Mead
Carter	French	Kendall	Michener
Casey	Fuller, Ill.	Kennedy, Iowa	Miller
Chindblom	Gallagher	Kincheloe	Minahan, N. J.
Christopherson	Gandy	King	Monahan, Wis.
Clark, Mo.	Ganly	Kinkaid	MondeLL
Claason	Garland	Kitchin	Moon
Cleary	Garner	Kieczka	Mooney

Moore, Ohio	Ramsey	Sinnott	Walsh
Moore, Pa.	Randall, Calif.	Slemp	Ward
Moore, Va.	Randall, Wis.	Small	Wason
Morgan	Rayburn	Smith, Idaho	Watkins
Mott	Reavis	Smith, Mich.	Watson, Pa.
Murphy	Reber	Snyder	Watson, Va.
Nelson, Mo.	Reed, N. Y.	Stedman	Weaver
Nelson, Wis.	Reed, W. Va.	Steele	Webb
Newton, Minn.	Rhodes	Stevenson	Webster
Nicholls, S. C.	Ricketts	Strong, Kans.	Welling
Nichols, Mich.	Riddick	Strong, Pa.	Welty
O'Connell	Robinson, N. C.	Summers, Wash.	Whaley
Ogden	Robison, Ky.	Sweet	Wheeler
Oliver	Rodenberg	Taylor, Ark.	White, Kans.
Olney	Rogers	Taylor, Tenn.	White, Me.
Osborne	Romjue	Thomas	Williams
Paige	Rose	Thompson, Ohio	Wilson, Ill.
Park	Rouse	Thompson, Okla.	Wilson, La.
Parker	Rowe	Timberlake	Wilson, Pa.
Parrish	Rubey	Tincher	Wingo
Peters	Rucker	Tinkham	Wood, Ind.
Platt	Sabath	Towner	Woods, Va.
Purnell	Sanders, Ind.	Treadway	Woodyard
Quin	Sanders, N. Y.	Upshaw	Wright
Radcliffe	Sears	Vaile	Yates
Rainey, H. T.	Sells	Vare	Young, N. Dak.
Rainey, J. W.	Shreve	Vestal	Young, Tex.
Raker	Sinclair	Vinson	Zihlman
Ramsey		Volstead	

NAYS—8.

Buchanan	Gard	Merritt	Sims
Curry, Calif.	Hardy, Tex.	Nolan	Sisson

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Dewalt Stillness Stiness

NOT VOTING—107.

Ayres	Eagan	Kettner	Sanders, La.
Barbour	Echols	Kiess	Sanford
Benson	Ellsworth	Kraus	Saunders, Va.
Blackmon	Fisher	Larsen	Schall
Browne	Fuller, Mass.	Lehlbach	Scully
Brumbaugh	Gallivan	Linthicum	Sherwood
Burke	Goldfogle	McFadden	Siegel
Butler	Goodall	McKenzie	Smith, Ill.
Caldwell	Goodwin, Ark.	McPherson	Smith, N. Y.
Campbell, Pa.	Gould	Mann	Smithwick
Cannon	Graham, Pa.	Mason	Snell
Cantrill	Greene, Vt.	Montague	Steagall
Carew	Griffin	Moorer, Ind.	Steenerson
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	Morin	Stephens, Miss.
Coady	Hardy, Colo.	Mudd	Stephens, Ohio
Collier	Hicks	Neely	Sullivan
Copley	Hill	Newton, Mo.	Summers, Tex.
Costello	Hull, Iowa	Oldfield	Taylor, Colo.
Crago	Humphreys	Overstreet	Temple
Dale	Hutchinson	Padgett	Tillman
Davey	Ireland	Pell	Tilson
Dempsey	James	Phelan	Venable
Denison	Johnson, S. Dak.	Porter	Voigt
Dent	Kahn	Pou	Walters
Donovan	Kelley, Mich.	Ragsdale	Winslow
Dooley	Kelly, Pa.	Riordan	Wise
Doughton	Kennedy, R. I.	Rowan	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
Until further notice:

Mr. BARBOUR with Mr. AYRES.
Mr. BROWN with Mr. BENSON.
Mr. BURKE with Mr. CALDWELL.
Mr. BUTLER with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.
Mr. CANNON with Mr. CANTRILL.
Mr. COPLELEY with Mr. CAREW.
Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
Mr. CRAGO with Mr. COLLIER.
Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. DAVEY.
Mr. DENISON with Mr. DONOVAN.
Mr. ECHOLS with Mr. DOOLING.
Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. EAGAN.
Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. FISHER.
Mr. GOODALL with Mr. GALLIVAN.
Mr. GOULD with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. GRIFFIN.
Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. KETTNER.
Mr. HARDY of Colorado with Mr. LINTHICUM.
Mr. HICKS with Mr. MONTAGUE.
Mr. HILL with Mr. NEELY.
Mr. HULL of Iowa with Mr. OLDFIELD.
Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. OVERSTREET.
Mr. JAMES with Mr. PADGETT.
Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. PELL.
Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. PHELAN.
Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. POUL.
Mr. KIESS with Mr. RAGSDALE.
Mr. IRELAND with Mr. COADY.
Mr. WINSLOW with Mr. DOUGHTON.
Mr. WALTERS with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.
Mr. SANFORD with Mr. HARRISON.
Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.
Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. SUMMERS of Texas.
Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.

Mr. McFADDEN with Mr. DEWALT.
Mr. KRAUS with Mr. RIORDAN.
Mr. McKENZIE with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.
Mr. MASON with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.
Mr. MOORES of Indiana with Mr. ROWAN.
Mr. MUDD with Mr. SCULLY.
Mr. NEWTON of Missouri with Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. PORTER with Mr. SHERWOOD.
Mr. RHODES with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.
Mr. SIEGEL with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.
Mr. SNEEL with Mr. TILLMAN.
Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. VENABLE.
Mr. TEMPLE with Mr. STEAGALL.
Mr. VOIGT with Mr. WISE.
Mr. TILSON with Mr. SULLIVAN.
Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I have a general pair with Mr. McFADDEN. I voted yea. I desire to withdraw that and answer "present."

The name of Mr. DEWALT was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to prefer a request for unanimous consent. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] have convinced me that this Railroad Administration resolution should have a hearing before their committee. Having been convinced by them on that point, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to withdraw the resolution from the consideration of the House and that the motion whereby the committee was discharged from further consideration be vacated, so that the resolution may be sent to that committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all proceedings had up to this time on the resolution be vacated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EMPLOYEES IN THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to discharge the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service from further consideration of H. Res. 73, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 73.

Resolved, That the Civil Service Commission be, and it is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees of said department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, brother or brothers, are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month, respectively, received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above the salary received by the Government employees in said department.

To direct the attention of said department more fully to the particular information requested, reference is made to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5.

The SPEAKER. The question is on discharging the committee from further consideration of the resolution.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RUCKER. I desire to discuss the resolution.

The SPEAKER. This is a motion to discharge the committee. No debate is in order under the rules. The question is on discharging the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, on page 1, line 11, by inserting after the word "employees" the words "in the Civil Service Commission."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, after the word "employees," by inserting the words "in the Civil Service Commission."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I think I owe it to my good friend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON], and to the rest of my colleagues, to take enough time to read to you the following statement:

WASHINGTON, D. C.

I, Mrs. C. S. Benton, upon oath state: I am secretary to Congressman BLANTON, in whose employ I have been for two years. Until my marriage to Maj. C. S. Benton, on March 12, 1919, my name was Mrs. Ruby Louis Arceneaux. Prior to March 1, 1919, I have worked quite a great deal at night in various Government departments, working from three to five hours per night, making from \$25 to \$30 a week for such night work, though I made as much as \$9 one night. While in the index card section of the War Risk Bureau, in the Elks' Hall on H Street NW., under Mr. Lawrence Gilmah as chief, I received a check for \$79.79 for two weeks, working those two weeks,

however, from 5 p. m. to 11.30 p. m. I also worked at 119 D Street, in the old Southern Building, in various sections of the War Risk Bureau. I know a number of Government employees who do such extra work at night in order to take advantage of the good compensation paid.

(Signed) Mrs. C. S. BENTON.

Sworn to and subscribed before me, the undersigned authority, on this the 26th day of March, A. D. 1919.

W. W. PICKERING,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I can not yield, because I do not want to waste any further time. I move the previous question on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RUCKER) there were—ayes 92, noes 41.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, on page 2, by striking out all of section 3, and upon that I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, strike out all of lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the previous question on the amendment.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to oppose the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, is there no way by which a Member of the House can be heard except the gentleman from Texas to oppose this amendment or any of them?

The SPEAKER. Any Member can be heard if the previous question is not ordered, but the previous question is not debatable. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for not to exceed five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. CRAMTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to inquire of the Speaker whether or not it is the policy to be pursued in this House that a man should try on half a dozen different occasions to oppose a resolution but can not get recognition?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. Speaker CLARK decided that in the closing hours of the last Congress.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I submit that it is a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman makes a motion to amend his resolution. We demand recognition to oppose the resolution, but the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to move the previous question and gives no other Member an opportunity to get recognition to oppose the resolution.

Mr. WALSH. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. The Chair will state the rule. As Members are well aware, the rule is that a Member in charge of a bill or resolution is always entitled to recognition to move the previous question. If the House adopts the previous question, of course, no one else is allowed to debate it; and the Chair is following the universal practice to always recognize the gentleman in charge of a bill to move the previous question.

Mr. BLANTON. And, Mr. Speaker, I asked recognition for that purpose.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRISP. I would like to call the attention of the Speaker to this proposition; I am not familiar with the conditions here. The Speaker stated the proposition exactly, except where the previous question is ordered on a motion where there has been no debate there are 20 minutes' debate on each side.

The SPEAKER. But complaint has been made that the gentleman from Texas had debated the question.

Mr. CRISP. Of course, the Chair is absolutely correct, then—

Mr. BLANTON. And I was asking for recognition.

The SPEAKER. Exactly; and the Chair feels compelled to recognize the gentleman in charge of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. No one is entitled to speak. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARTER. Debate can be had on this resolution, can it not, if the gentleman from Texas will not insist on the previous question?

The SPEAKER. It could have been, but it is too late now.

Mr. CARTER. I mean when the motion was made.

The SPEAKER. The House has ordered the previous question.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLACK. I think the Chair stated in error when he says we had adopted the previous question on this particular resolution, because we have not.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk so informs the Chair.

Mr. BLACK. I think the Members will agree we have not.

Mr. WALSH. It was adopted.

The SPEAKER. The House has ordered the previous question. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The question was taken, and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUCKER. Does the Chair think it will do me any good for me to ask for a division?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES IN THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department be discharged from further consideration of House resolution 74, and upon that I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department be discharged from further consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 74.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the War Department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month respectively received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above their Government salary, received by the Government employees in said department.

Attention is directed to the form of questionnaire in House joint resolution 5 as one calculated to elicit the information sought.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. No debate is in order.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT. On yesterday the House passed a resolution providing for a special committee, and in that resolution there was conferred upon that committee to be appointed all the jurisdiction which under the general rules of the House belongs to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. Now, my inquiry is, Is this resolution, in view of the action taken by the House yesterday, now privileged, or could it be without being before that new committee, upon which these functions have been conferred by action of the House, for seven days?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recall the exact language, but the Chair's recollection is that the special committee was given the powers of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. The Chair's recollection of the language would be that it did not supplant the Committee on Expenditures but that it gave them the same jurisdiction, and if the gentleman wishes to look up the matter, can he refer to it—

Mr. GARRETT. I think I can find it here in the Record. The question, I will say to the Chair, I think is somewhat important to be considered at this time. The language is on page 640 of the Record. The resolution will be found there.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the impression that does not mean to supersede the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. It simply confers on that new committee such additional powers. The Chair would rule that the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department was still in existence.

Mr. GARRETT. The thought that was in my mind, and I am only submitting this because—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT. Because of its possible importance in other matters. I think it probable that the committee was superseded. Certainly its character was to some extent changed; if not its jurisdiction, certainly its personnel. The resolution which was passed, of course, does not say where the personnel of that committee is to come from. That is within the discretion of the Speaker. Of course, it seems to be generally understood that gentlemen who are now members of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department will become members of this special committee, but that is a matter with the Chair wholly. Now, there is in fact created here a new special committee, and upon that committee there is conferred all of the powers, all of the authority, and all of the jurisdiction that has up until now been exercised by this standing committee of the House.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARRETT. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. Does not the gentleman think that the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, after having acquired jurisdiction, could not have it taken away from them by the subsequent appointment of a committee, even if it included the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department?

Mr. GARRETT. Well, no; I do not think so. I think if, by the action of the House, the character of a committee is changed and the jurisdiction of it is changed—I mean changed to another committee—if that, in fact, has been done, if this resolution be construed to mean that, the reasoning of the gentleman from Iowa would not apply.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think the Chair is entirely correct in his view that the appointment of the select committee in no wise affected the status or the jurisdiction of the existing committee. Two committees exist; but whether that be true or not can not affect the matter now before the House. This resolution was properly referred to the regular standing committee, and the motion is to discharge that committee. Therefore it matters not what the effect of the later action of the House relative to the appointment of a new select committee may be. A motion to discharge the committee to which this resolution was referred, and properly referred, is in order.

Mr. GARRETT. Provided it was before the committee seven days, which this has been; and, I insist, provided further, that the jurisdiction has not been taken away from that standing committee by action of the House within the seven days.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman would not suggest there was anything in the resolution adopted by the House that took from the regular standing committee its jurisdiction. But whether that be true or not, this resolution was referred to that committee, and if it is now the desire of the House to have that committee discharged for any purpose, either for the purpose of passing the resolution or re-referring it, this motion is in order.

Mr. GARRETT. If the Chair will bear with me just a moment, here is where I think important questions may arise in the future. Will this special committee have all the jurisdiction that under the general rules of the House is conferred upon the Committee on Expenditures? For instance, upon matters other than the investigation which this committee is to make, upon whatever resolutions or bills will be referred to this committee, will they go to the seven Members who constitute the present standing committee of the House, and will the jurisdiction of matters other than this investigation be confined to those seven members, or will that whole committee

of 15 have the jurisdiction which heretofore has been exercised by the standing committee?

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. Will not this be the situation, that matters referred by the Speaker to the select committee will come under the jurisdiction of the select committee, but, on the other hand, a reference to the standing committee would bring the matter under the jurisdiction of the standing committee? I doubt not that the Speaker will have that in mind when matters are referred by him.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the question of order raised by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] can readily be settled. The resolution of yesterday requires the Speaker to appoint a committee which, among other things, shall have the powers of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. The Chair has not yet appointed such a committee, and therefore it seems to the Chair it is impossible to say that now, before the appointment of such a committee, the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department has been abolished. Therefore it seems clear that a motion to discharge the committee is in order. After the new committee is appointed the Chair will give consideration to the point raised by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I understand the motion to discharge the committee has already been adopted.

The SPEAKER. The motion to discharge the committee has not yet been put. The question is on discharging the committee.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, without further yielding the floor, I wish to say that I never have believed in gagging anybody, and I think I owe it to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] to yield to him to be heard in opposition to this resolution. Therefore I yield such time as he may want, otherwise reserving the floor. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. RUCKER. Ten minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] embarrassed me somewhat when he offered to yield me time. I told him frankly I did not want to accept time from him because I was opposed to his resolution. And he embarrasses me in the speech he just made, in which he disclaims a purpose to gag the membership of the House. The gentleman flatters himself—he can not gag the House except for a brief season, and he can only do that with the aid of Republican Members. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He makes the Republican side act very much like a jumping-jack, and the performance is very ridiculous in the eyes of the world.

What is the proposition? To discharge a committee. What committee? A committee appointed by the present Speaker of this House—a Republican committee—not divided exactly as badly as the one the Chair is going to appoint, not 2 to 1, but to all practical purposes it is just as bad.

Mr. FLOOD. It is 2 to 5.

Mr. RUCKER. That is worse than the other. The effort is to discharge a Republican committee of the House from the consideration of a resolution regularly referred to that committee by a Republican Speaker, and yet you Republicans, when a division is demanded, in order to secure time and opportunity to debate the pending resolution, every one of you stands up here at the behests of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] as if you were proud of your new leadership. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Every one of you votes to do what? To discharge your own committee, appointed by your own Speaker, and to discharge it without debate or consideration. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Oh, gentlemen, your conduct is flimsy and hypocritical. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is playing into your hands, and you think you will gain some political advantage. Nobody objects to the inquiry proposed, but we do object to this spectacular performance put on the stage by the gentleman from Texas, which can result in no good but which will require the useless expenditure of a large sum of money. You Republicans have demonstrated that you will vote to help any turbulent Democrat do a turbulent and foolish thing. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What is it? Why, the State Department, the War Department, the Interior Department, the Post Office Department, and every other department of the Government, in order to satisfy the inquiries, the inquisitiveness and curiosity of the gentleman from Texas, must investigate, tell the world how many of those

antiquated people down there in the Treasury Department or in the Interior Department or in the War Department how many of those old superannuated ladies and gentlemen have nieces or nephews or cousins or uncles or aunts in these or some other department of the Government. How are you going to get it? Get it from the files? The Lord knows the Government has not room enough in its archives to hold all the files that have been piling up since this abominable practice of civil service—and I want it understood that I mean what I say—since this fraudulent device called civil service was fostered upon the people, and hence you will have to get the information by personal inquiry, if you get it at all. There are some 110,000 or 115,000 clerks in the various departments in Washington.

And the gentleman from Texas asks that a personal inquiry be presented to each and every clerk to ascertain whether he has a brother or a sister or an aunt or a cousin or a stepfather or a stepsister or a stepmother or a stepbrother or some one else of a remote degree of relationship to him somewhere in the Government service; after you get that information what are you going to do about it? The worst condition that can possibly be revealed will not provoke a worse criticism or one more embarrassing and humiliating than the admissions which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has made in this debate. [Applause.]

Oh, you gentlemen talk about economy. You are the most valiant set of economists the world has ever known. You are rabid in your enthusiastic desire for economy. We had an exhibition of Republican economy yesterday and have had for several days while the Agricultural appropriation bill—one of the greatest bills ever considered by this House—was under consideration, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and other good Republicans, exemplars of governmental economy, stood up here and howled and whooped and stormed about the reckless extravagance that had been practiced in the framing of the Agricultural appropriation bill, and denounced the bill. [Laughter.]

That distinguished and flowery orator and statesman from the State of Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who seldom ever addresses the House, said the bill was the offspring of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]. Well, if the gentleman from South Carolina is the sire of that bill and the Republican membership is its dam, I am somewhat suspicious of it, although it looks good to me. [Laughter.] But what about the Agricultural appropriation bill? You Republicans confess that you reported the bill of the gentleman from South Carolina bodily, with only two or three amendments, and what are the amendments? Some great change in policy? No. Following the lead of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], as you ought to do if you want to serve your country at all, following the course he has established for you to pursue during the brief term of Republican control in the House, you adopted his bill literally, and the only change you reformers and economists made in it was to increase the amounts appropriated in two or three paragraphs, and yet you have the nerve to talk about economy. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes, with pleasure.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman complain about that?

Mr. RUCKER. No.

Mr. MADDEN. If he does, we will fix it on the next bill so that he can not complain.

Mr. RUCKER. I am making no complaint—I am not in the least surprised, but I am discussing insincerity, and I do not care whether it applies to Illinois or to Texas; if you were sincere, how comes it that every one of you Republicans voted for the Agricultural appropriation bill which so many of you denounced in debate? Your delay of it cost the Government of the United States nearly the amount the bill carries. [Laughter.] I am speaking extravagantly on that perhaps, but a man is liable to become extravagant when he looks into the faces of these distinguished men and great economists on the Republican side of the House and reflects that we must endure them for two long years. [Laughter.] I well remember on my first entry into this House at this session what awe and wonder came over me when I looked over that side of the House and saw all those strange people and missed so many familiar faces of good men on this side. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, personally I like those gentlemen over there very well as individuals, but I object to the number of them. [Laughter.] I would have more confidence in the wisdom of our legislation and be happier if we could subtract about 50 from the Republican side of the House. [Laughter.] The trouble is you have too much power to do wrong, and you exercise it too frequently. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman has referred to a bill. What bill had he reference to?

Mr. RUCKER. The Lever bill, the Agricultural appropriation bill, that you took over from him.

Mr. HAUGEN. Let me say to the gentleman, for his information, that the bill as it passed the House carried nearly \$5,000,000 less than the amount carried by it when reported by the Democratic Senate.

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, no good man will hold the House responsible for the action of the Senate. Do not tell me about what the Senate did! How much will the Senate add to the Lever bill, which you accepted and approved and asked the House to adopt last week? [Laughter.]

Gentlemen, I hope the time will come when men everywhere and of every political party will have the courage of their convictions and learn that even yet consistency is a jewel. You Republicans vote to discharge all these committees, and they are of your own creation. Why? What does it mean? Another \$100,000 in all probability will be expended in order to ascertain how many cousins and brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law and husbands and wives and uncles and aunts are employed in the Treasury Department, and when you get it what will you do with it? What earthly value will the information be to Congress or to the country? The law permits at least two of a family to hold civil-service positions.

The gentleman from Texas says the joint legislative committee that was recently appointed, Mr. Speaker, by your predecessor, under a law passed by Congress, will not make a report, or if it makes a report there will be nothing in it. Oh, the gentleman's wisdom is perhaps extensive, he is the embodiment of much that is good and all that is bad in Texas [laughter], and he seriously fears the committee may not report everything demanded by his peculiar tastes and notions, his conception of ethics in public affairs, and his ideas of administering governmental functions.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RUCKER. I have not the time. The gentleman from Texas will demand the previous question within the hour.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Just a question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time would the gentleman like?

Mr. RUCKER. Ten minutes more.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Does the gentleman think that the gentleman from Texas does not have the conviction of his own opinions?

Mr. RUCKER. "Does he not have the conviction of his own opinions?" [Laughter.] The gentleman propounds a conundrum, and I am not good at solving conundrums, therefore I can not answer it. I would respectfully refer the gentleman from Nebraska to my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who perhaps can answer him. I confess I can not answer the inquiry submitted, and as my time is short I hope I will not be interrupted with requests to solve any more Chinese puzzles. [Laughter.]

The gentleman says that the joint committee appointed by the Speaker, composed of three distinguished ex-Members of the House, will not perform its duty. I do not know exactly what accusation the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] made against that commission, because I was not in the room, but I understand he paid his respects to that commission this morning, and that the burden of his song was that that great joint committee—composed of men who certainly are his equals in intellectual attainments, in fidelity to duty, and in integrity of character—had failed or refused to accept and adopt his peculiar method of preparing a questionnaire. Oh, he tells the House, and told it yesterday and the day before, that he had appealed to that commission to insert in the questionnaire a certain question designed to secure information as to what other employments, if any, Government clerks are engaged in, and the commission refused to do it. The gentleman charged that, as I am informed.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman admits my statement is true, and I charge that a half truth is often worse than a falsehood,

because it generally suppresses and conceals facts which ought to be stated in order that the exact truth may be known.

The gentleman knows that the letters he wrote to members of that commission were written three days after every questionnaire had been printed, and that his letter reached the commission on the same day that those printed questionnaires were actually placed in the hands of more than 100,000 clerks in the employ of the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I do not know anything of the kind.

Mr. RUCKER. Well, then, I will tell you something else that you do not know. "There are more things in Heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy." [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Sure.

Mr. RUCKER. Let me say to you that the poet correctly described the conduct of some people—I am not going to point out any particular man on that side or this—when he wrote:

With smooth dissimulation, skilled to grace
A devil's purpose with an angel's face.

And then another great author dealing with the same sort of a man says:

And thus I clothe my naked villany
With old odd ends stolen out of holy writ,
And seem a saint when most I play the devil.

If that fits anybody here let him wear it. It seems to me so unjustifiable and absurd for one claiming to be a Democrat to raise all this fury and commotion here for the amusement and gratification of the majority party. No one of them would aid or encourage the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] if he did not hope to derive some political advantage from this unseemly and unwise performance.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. For just one question.

Mr. RUCKER. Yes; I gladly yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the gentleman expect anybody on that side would weed out of this Government any graft or corruption? It has to come from a Democrat if it is to be done at all.

Mr. RUCKER. I think you are right in that, but they are helping you and I am afraid you do not know what the devil you are doing. Whatever you are trying to do they are all helping you, every mother's son of them. [Laughter.] And as every one of the Republican Members is opposed, according to your own testimony, to any exposure of graft, I think they must be after something else, and you do not seem to know it. You are making political capital for them, and they have sense enough to know it, though you do not seem to know it. I repeat that the vicious tirades of the gentleman from Texas against that commission are unbecoming and unwarranted. Those gentlemen deserve no criticism at the hands of Members of the House. They are performing a great duty, and if this House permits them to finish the work which they are doing they will make a report that will at least be gratifying to Congress and to a hundred million people in this Nation, whether the gentleman from Texas is satisfied or not. Let me tell you it is a big task. There are over 110,000 employees in the Government service under the jurisdiction of that committee. The work can not be done in a minute; but I have reason to believe that conditions have been discovered, and will ultimately be revealed, which will surprise this House and excite deep interest throughout the country. And let me tell you in confidence you gentlemen on the Republican side are responsible for that condition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we had some discussion here a day or so ago about—what do you call that roller thing?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Steam roller.

Mr. RUCKER. Of course, you gentlemen on the Republican side know what it is because you are familiar with it. If ever I want to get a correct definition or name of any of these modern engines in politics which make men lose their manhood and their individuality, I always go over to the Republican side and there get accurate information, because you know what these things are. But we have heard something about that, and now the steam roller is to do something here that the gentleman from Texas advocates. If the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARNETT], recognized as a leader and as one in authority, or if the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the chosen leader of our side of this House, offers a proposition here, you gentlemen become agitated and call for quorums and for divisions and roll calls and raise thunder about it; but when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] asks you to engage in a piece of folly which he hopes will embarrass somebody in administration circles and enable him to return to Congress then you Republicans all vote for it.

Now, I refer again to the steam-roller business which in a few moments will be resorted to. A dozen Democrats have

sought to get the floor and, under the rules of the House as construed—and I assume correctly construed by the Speaker—nobody can be heard unless by the grace of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] we are permitted to take the floor. See how ungracious a position it puts me in. I have permission to speak here this evening, not by right of my membership in this House, not because the sovereign people of the greatest Democratic district in America sent me here [laughter]—do not laugh at that for it is true—but because the gentleman allows me to speak. Yes; I am indebted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and must doff my hat to him for the poor privilege of standing here and indulging in these desultory remarks.

Mr. HARDY. They will vote for the previous question, and then you do not have any rights.

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, yes; they will vote for the previous question and deny Members an opportunity to speak. They do not want to hear the pending resolution discussed.

Mr. Speaker, I discover my time is up. I thank the gentleman from Texas for the privilege of occupying the floor a few moments.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that on page 1, in the first line of the second section, after the word "employees," the words "in the War Department" be inserted; and also the following amendment, that, on page 2, section 3 be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not offer two amendments at the same time.

Mr. BLANTON. I thought maybe there would be no objection to it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 1, line 5, after the word "employees" insert "in the War Department."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out section 3, on page 2.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 2, strike out section 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. GARNER. And on that, Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays. I want to know who it is that wants to spend this hundred thousand dollars or more on these resolutions.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 109, answered "present" 1 not voting 138, as follows:

YEAS—181.

Ackerman	Emerson	Juul	Quin
Alexander	Evans, Mont.	Kendall	Radcliffe
Almon	Evans, Nebr.	Kennedy, Iowa	Raker
Anderson	Evans, Nev.	Kettner	Ramsey
Andrews, Md.	Fairfield	Kincheloe	Ramseyer
Andrews, Nebr.	Ferris	Kinkaid	Randall, Calif.
Ashbrook	Fess	Klecza	Randall, Wis.
Ayres	Focht	Knutson	Reavis
Babka	Fordney	Kreider	Reber
Bacharach	Foster	Langley	Reed, N. Y.
Baer	Frear	Layton	Reed, W. Va.
Begg	French	Lea, Calif.	Rhodes
Benham	Fuller, Ill.	Little	Ricketts
Bland, Ind.	Garland	Longworth	Robison, Ky.
Blanton	Glynn	Luce	Rogers
Boies	Goodall	Lufkin	Rose
Bowers	Goodykoontz	Luhling	Rouse
Brooks, Ill.	Graham, Ill.	McClintie	Rowe
Brooks, Pa.	Green, Iowa	McKinley	Ruby
Browning	Greene, Mass.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, N. Y.
Burdick	Griest	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Scott
Burroughs	Hadley	MacCrate	Sells
Campbell, Kans.	Hamilton	Madden	Shreve
Chindblom	Hardy, Colo.	Magee	Sinclair
Christopherson	Hasfell	Mapes	Sinnot
Classon	Haugen	Michener	Smith, Idaho
Cole	Hawley	Miller	Smith, Mich.
Cooper	Hays	Monahan, Wis.	Snyder
Copley	Healin	Mondell	Stiness
Cramton	Hernandez	Moore, Ohio	Strong, Kans.
Crowther	Hersey	Moore, Pa.	Summers, Wash.
Currie, Mich.	Hickey	Morgan	Taylor, Tenn.
Dallinger	Hoch	Murphy	Thompson, Ohio
Darrow	Houghton	Nelson, Wis.	Tillman
Davis, Minn.	Howard	Newton, Minn.	Timberlake
Dickinson, Iowa	Huddleston	Nicholls, S. C.	Tincher
Dowell	Hullings	Nichols, Mich.	Tinkham
Dunbar	Jacoway	Ogden	Towner
Dunn	Jefferis	Osborne	Valle
Echols	Johnson, Ky.	Paige	Vare
Edmonds	Johnson, S. Dak.	Peters	Vestal
Elliot	Johnson, Wash.	Purnell	Volstead

Walsh
Ward
Wason
Webster

Wheeler
White, Kans.
White, Me.
Williams

Wilson, Ill.
Wood, Ind.
Woodyard
Young, N. Dak.

Zihlman

NAYS—109.

Aswell
Bankhead
Barkley
Bee
Bell
Black
Bland, Mo.
Bland, Va.
Booher
Box
Brand
Briggs
Buchanan
Byrnes, S. C.
Byrns, Tenn.
Candler
Caraway
Carss
Carter
Casey
Clark, Fla.
Clark, Mo.
Cleary
Crisp
Curry, Calif.
Davis, Tenn.
Dickinson, Mo.
Dominick

Drane
Dupré
Dyer
Eagle
Fitzgerald
Flood
Gallagher
Ganly
Gard
Garner
Garrett
Hardy, Tex.
Hastings
Hayden
Holland
Hudspeth
Hull, Tenn.
Igoe
Johnson, Miss.
Johnston, N. Y.
Jones, Tex.
Lanham
Lankford
Lee, Ga.
Leshar
Lever
Lonergan
McAndrews

McDuffie
McGlennon
McKeown
McKiniry
McLane
Maher
Major
Mansfield
Martin
Mays
Mend
Minahan, N. J.
Moon
Mooney
Moore, Va.
Nelson, Mo.
O'Connell
Oldfield
Oliver
Overstreet
Park
Parrish
Platt
Rainey, H. T.
Rainey, J. W.
Rayburn
Robinson, N. C.
Romjue

Rucker
Sanders, La.
Sisson
Stedman
Steele
Stevenson
Taylor, Ark.
Taylor, Colo.
Thomas
Thompson, Okla.
Upshaw
Venable
Vinson
Watkins
Watson, Va.
Weaver
Webb
Welling
Welty
Wilson, La.
Wilson, Pa.
Wingo
Woods, Va.
Wright
Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Dewalt

NOT VOTING—138.

Anthony
Barbour
Benson
Blackmon
Brinson
Britten
Browne
Brumbaugh
Burke
Butler
Caldwell
Campbell, Pa.
Cannon
Cantrill
Carew
Coady
Collier
Connally
Costello
Crago
Cullen
Dale
Davey
Dempsey
Denison
Dent
Donovan
Dooling
Doremus
Doughton
Eagan
Ellsworth
Elston
Esch
Fields

Fisher
Freeman
Fuller, Mass.
Gallivan
Gandy
Goldwin, N. C.
Goldfogle
Good
Goodwin, Ark.
Gould
Graham, Pa.
Greene, Vt.
Griffin
Hamill
Harrison
Hersman
Hicks
Hill
Hull, Iowa
Humphreys
Husted
Hutchinson
Ireland
James
Jones, Pa.
Kahn
Kearns
Kelley, Mich.
Kelly, Pa.
Kennedy, R. I.
Kliss
King
Kitchin
Kraus
LaGuardia

Lampert
Larsen
Lazaro
Lehbach
Linthicum
McArthur
McCulloch
McFadden
McKenzie
McPherson
MacGregor
Mann
Mason
Merritt
Montague
Moore, Ind.
Morin
Mott
Mudd
Neely
Newton, Mo.
Nolan
Olney
Padgett
Parker
Pell
Phelan
Porter
Pou
Ragsdale
Riddick
Riordan
Rodenberg
Rowan
Sabath

Sanders, Ind.
Sanford
Saunders, Va.
Schall
Scully
Sears
Sherwood
Siegel
Sims
Slemp
Small
Smith, Ill.
Smith, N. Y.
Smithwick
Snell
Steagall
Steenerson
Stephens, Miss.
Stephens, Ohio
Strong, Pa.
Sullivan
Sumners, Tex.
Sweet
Temple
Tilson
Treadway
Voigt
Walters
Watson, Pa.
Whaley
Winslow
Wise
Yates

So the resolution was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. BRINSON.

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. CONNALLY.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. DOREMUS.

Mr. FRENCH with Mr. CULLEN.

Mr. GOOD with Mr. GALLIVAN.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. HUSTED with Mr. LINTHICUM.

Mr. KEARNS with Mr. HERSMAN.

Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. KING with Mr. LAZARO.

Mr. MCARTHUR with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. OLNEY.

Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. POY.

Mr. MOTT with Mr. SABATH.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. SEARS.

Mr. STRONG with Mr. SMITHWICK.

Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the House and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. KING. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, instead of being present and listening, I was at my office working.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not qualify.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I can not qualify, but I want to know if I can answer "present."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I have a general pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MCFADDEN. I voted "no," and I wish to withdraw that vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. DEWALT was called, and he answered "Present," as above recorded.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES IN THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department be discharged from further consideration of House resolution 75, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 75.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives, at the earliest date practicable, the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the Treasury Department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month, respectively, received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above their Government salary, received by the Government employees in said department.

Attention is directed to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5 as one calculated to elicit the information sought.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend on page 1, line 11, by inserting after the word "employees" the words "in the Treasury Department," and on page 2 by striking out section 3.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees" insert "in the Treasury Department," and, on page 2, strike out section 3.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I think this amendment is a good one and needs no further argument. Therefore I move the previous question on the amendment.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLACK. Is it not in order to divide this amendment and offer a substitute for it?

The SPEAKER. It is in order to separate the amendment. It is in order to offer a substitute unless the previous question is ordered.

Mr. BLANTON. I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it would be in order to offer a substitute unless the previous question is ordered.

Mr. BLACK. I have a substitute that I want to offer.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has moved the previous question.

The SPEAKER. But parliamentary inquiries are being made.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the gentleman has offered one amendment to line 11 and on that has moved the previous question.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understands it the gentleman offered one amendment, which embraced two sections, and on that amendment the previous question is demanded.

Mr. WINGO. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. What is the point of order?

Mr. WINGO. It goes to two different sections in one amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows of no rule that forbids that.

Mr. WINGO. Considering one section at a time or considering the whole thing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will excuse the Chair, but perhaps he did not understand.

Mr. WINGO. I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. Oh, certainly; any gentleman can ask for a division of the amendment.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to propound this parliamentary inquiry: Do I not have the right to offer a substitute to the first part of his amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the right unless the previous question is ordered.

Mr. BLACK. I offer that substitute.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the Chair?

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. Does the Chair hold that if the previous question is ordered on the resolution and amendments a substitute for the amendment can not be offered?

The SPEAKER. Yes; the Chair would hold that. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division on the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks for a division on the previous question.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 79, noes 71.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. RUCKER. For a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Louisiana make the point of order that there is no quorum present?

Mr. ASWELL. I withdraw it for a moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RUCKER. I respectfully ask if it will be in order to move to remove the gentleman from Wyoming and put the gentleman from Texas in as a majority leader.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that is a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, the gentleman would make a good one.

Mr. RUCKER. I think there is where he ought to be; he ought to be on that side.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. BLANTON. Recommit where?

Mr. BLACK. To the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department. I offer the following motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will first state that the question was taken and the previous question was ordered.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I make the point of order that the committee being discharged from the consideration of the resolution the motion is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think the point of order holds.

Mr. BLACK. I make the motion to recommit, and the motion is to recommit the bill to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, with instructions to strike out section 2 of the bill, and report forthwith.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers the motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report. The Chair neglected to ask the gentleman if he is opposed to the resolution?

Mr. BLACK. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLACK moves to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, with instructions to strike out section 2 of the resolution, and report forthwith.

Mr. BLACK. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to discuss the question.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, no; the previous question has been ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not the floor; the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. BLACK. Not on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GARNER. No; the previous question has not been ordered on this motion to recommit; it is on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct, but the Chair's recollection is that the previous question is not necessary on a motion to recommit except to prevent amendment and that debate is not permissible.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I can cite the Chair to an instance—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to have the gentleman do so.

Mr. GARRETT. In which a motion to recommit was made and there was debate, at least I think I can.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is perfectly willing—

Mr. GARRETT. No; the matter my friend here has in mind is not that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the previous question prevents debate. The object of the previous question on a motion to recommit is to prevent amendments. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. RUCKER. Is it in order to ask unanimous consent to give the gentleman from Texas five minutes to discuss it? I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I object to that; ordinarily I would not object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the Chair was in doubt.

The question was again taken; and there were—ayes 70, noes 103.

Mr. BLACK. On that I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Clearly there is no quorum present. The Sergeant at Arms will summon absent Members, the Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. MAPES. Is it too late to make the point of order that a motion to recommit on a simple resolution is not in order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is too late, the vote having been taken.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 116, nays 162, answered "present" 2, not voting 149, as follows:

YEAS—116.

Alexander	Crisp	Lankford	Rainey, J. W.
Almon	Davis, Tenn.	Lea, Calif.	Rayburn
Ashbrook	Dominick	Leshner	Romjue
Aswell	Drane	McAndrews	Rouse
Ayres	Dupré	McClintic	Rucker
Babka	Evans, Mont.	McDuffie	Sanders, La.
Bankhead	Fitzgerald	McGlennon	Sisson
Bee	Flood	McKeown	Smithwick
Bell	Gallagher	McKinley	Stedman
Black	Ganly	McLane	Steele
Bland, Mo.	Gard	Maher	Stevenson
Bland, Va.	Garner	Major	Taylor, Ark.
Booher	Garrett	Mansfield	Taylor, Colo.
Box	Hardy, Tex.	Martin	Thomas
Brand	Hastings	Mead	Thompson, Okla.
Briggs	Hayden	Minahan, N. J.	Tillman
Buchanan	Holland	Moon	Upshaw
Byrnes, S. C.	Howard	Mooney	Vinson
Byrnes, Tenn.	Hudspeth	Moore, Va.	Watkins
Candler	Hull, Tenn.	Nelson, Mo.	Watson, Va.
Caraway	Igoe	Nicholls, S. C.	Weaver
Carss	Jacoway	Nolan	Welling
Carter	Johnson, Miss.	O'Connell	Welty
Casey	Johnston, N. Y.	Oldfield	Wilson, La.
Clark, Fla.	Jones, Tex.	Oliver	Wilson, Pa.
Clark, Mo.	Kincheloe	Park	Wingo
Cleary	King	Parrish	Woods, Va.
Collier	Kitchin	Quinn	Wright
Connally	Lanham	Ragsdale	Young, Tex.

NAYS—162.

Ackerman	Currie, Mich.	French	Hulings
Anderson	Curry, Calif.	Fuller, Ill.	Husted
Andrews, Md.	Dallinger	Garland	Jeffers
Andrews, Nebr.	Darrow	Glynn	Johnson, Ky.
Bacharach	Davis, Minn.	Goodell	Johnson, S. Dak.
Baer	Dickinson, Iowa	Goodykoontz	Johnson, Wash.
Begg	Dowell	Gould	Jones, Pa.
Benham	Dunbar	Graham, Ill.	Juul
Bland, Ind.	Dunn	Green, Iowa	Kendall
Blanton	Dyer	Greene, Mass.	Kennedy, Iowa
Boles	Echols	Griest	Kinkaid
Bowers	Edmonds	Hadley	Klecza
Brooks, Ill.	Elliott	Hardy, Colo.	Knutson
Brooks, Pa.	Elston	Haskett	Kreider
Burroughs	Emerson	Hawley	Lampert
Campbell, Kans.	Evans, Nebr.	Hays	Layton
Chandlomb	Evans, Nev.	Hernandez	Longworth
Christopherson	Fairfield	Hersey	Luce
Cole	Focht	Hickey	Lufkin
Copley	Fordney	Hoch	Lubring
Cramton	Foster	Houghton	McArthur
Crowther	Freeman	Huddleston	McCulloch

McKinley	Ogden	Rogers	Tinkham
McLaughlin, Mich.	Osborne	Rose	Towner
McLaughlin, Nebr.	Paige	Rowe	Vare
MacCrate	Peters	Sanders, N. Y.	Vestal
MacGregor	Platt	Scott	Walsh
Madden	Purnell	Sells	Wason
Magee	Radcliffe	Shreve	Webster
Mapes	Raker	Sinclair	Wheeler
Michener	Ramsey	Slomp	White, Kans.
Miller	Ramseyer	Smith, Mich.	White, Me.
Monahan, Wis.	Randall, Wis.	Snyder	Williams
Mondell	Reavis	Stephens, Ohio	Wilson, Ill.
Moore, Ohio	Reber	Strong, Kans.	Wood, Ind.
Moore, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.	Strong, Pa.	Woodyard
Morgan	Reed, W. Va.	Summers, Wash.	Yates
Murphy	Rhodes	Taylor, Tenn.	Young, N. Dak.
Nelson, Wis.	Ricketts	Thompson, Ohio	Zihlman
Newton, Minn.	Riddick	Timberlake	
Nichols, Mich.	Robison, Ky.	Tincher	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.
Dewalt Lonergan

NOT VOTING—149.

Anthony	Ferris	Larsen	Sanford
Barbour	Fess	Lazaro	Saunders, Va.
Barkley	Fields	Lee, Ga.	Schall
Benson	Fisher	Leibach	Scully
Blackmon	Frear	Lever	Sears
Brinson	Fuller, Mass.	Linthicum	Sherwood
Britten	Gallivan	Little	Siegel
Browne	Gandy	McFadden	Sims
Browning	Godwin, N. C.	McKenzie	Sinnott
Brumbaugh	Goldfogle	McPherson	Small
Burdick	Good	Mann	Smith, Idaho
Burke	Goodwin, Ark.	Mason	Smith, Ill.
Butler	Graham, Pa.	Mays	Smith, N. Y.
Caldwell	Greene, Vt.	Merritt	Snell
Campbell, Pa.	Griffin	Montague	Steagall
Cannon	Hamill	Moore, Ind.	Steenerson
Cantrill	Hamilton	Morin	Stephens, Miss.
Carew	Harrison	Mott	Stiness
Classon	Haugen	Mudd	Sullivan
Coady	Heflin	Neely	Summers, Tex.
Cooper	Hersman	Newton, Mo.	Sweet
Costello	Hicks	Olney	Temple
Crago	Hill	Overstreet	Tilson
Cullen	Hull, Iowa	Padgett	Treadway
Dale	Humphreys	Parker	Valle
Davey	Hutchinson	Pell	Venable
Dempsey	Ireland	Phelan	Voigt
Denison	James	Porter	Volstead
Dent	Kahn	Pou	Walters
Dickinson, Mo.	Kearns	Rainey, H. T.	Ward
Donovan	Kelley, Mich.	Randall, Calif.	Watson, Pa.
Doolling	Kelly, Pa.	Riordan	Webb
Doremus	Kennedy, R. I.	Robinson, N. C.	Whaley
Doughton	Kettner	Rodenberg	Winslow
Eagan	Kless	Rowan	Wise
Eagle	Kraus	Rubey	
Ellsworth	LaGuardia	Sabath	
Esch	Langley	Sanders, Ind.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected:

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BROWNING with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. COOPER with Mr. GANDY.

Mr. FESS with Mr. HEFLIN.

Mr. FREAR with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. MERRITT with Mr. LAZARO.

Mr. SCHALL with Mr. MAYS.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho with Mr. RANDALL of California.

Mr. STINESS with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.

Mr. SWEET with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.

Mr. VOLSTEAD with Mr. WEBB.

Mr. WARD with Mr. RUBEY.

Mr. KRAUS with Mr. SEARS.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. LEVER.

For balance of day:

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea," but I have a general pair with Mr. MCFADDEN, and I now desire to withdraw the vote of "yea" and answer "present."

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the passage of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has already been ordered. The question now is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of House resolution 76, and upon that I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 76.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) The names of all Government employees in the various branches of the Commerce Department who are employed by any person, firm, or corporation, the name of such employer, the hours of service given to such employer, and the amount of compensation received by such employee per month for such outside service.

(2) The names of all employees whose spouse (wife or husband), father, mother, sister or sisters, or brother or brothers are in the employ of the Government, their names, department of service, hours of service, and amount of compensation per month, respectively, received by each and all of said relatives.

(3) The amount of annual income, if any, over and above their Government salary received by the Government employees in said department.

Attention is directed to the form of questionnaire in H. J. Res. 5 as one calculated to elicit the information sought.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. The committee has not been discharged. The question is on the motion to discharge the committee.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what became of the amendments to the last resolution. They were never voted on. The resolution has not been passed with the amendments? Are they embodied in the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks they were voted on and passed.

Mr. WINGO. I asked for a division on that, and the gentleman moved the previous question. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] came in with a motion to recommit, and I have sat patiently waiting for a vote on that, because I wanted a separate vote on each of the two amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman is mistaken. The motion was agreed to before the motion to recommit was put.

Mr. BLANTON. That was the case, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is aware that a separation was not made. The gentleman asked the Chair if they could be separated, and the Chair said they could, but no request was made at the proper time.

Mr. WINGO. I think the Chair will find that the reporter's notes will show the question was never put on the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may be right.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees" insert "Department of Commerce," and on page 2, strike out all of section 3.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees" insert "Department of Commerce," and on page 2 strike out all of section 3.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I think these are good amendments. I do not know that any good would be derived from argument, and I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the amendments.

The question was taken; and the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum, and the Chair will count. [The Speaker proceeded to count.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, to save time, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not do that while the Chair is counting to ascertain whether or not there is a quorum present. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-eight gentlemen are present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 185, nays 89, answered "present" 1, not voting 154, as follows:

YEAS—185.

Ackerman	Andrews, Nebr.	Baer	Boles
Alexander	Anthony	Begg	Bowers
Almon	Ashbrook	Benham	Brooks, Ill.
Anderson	Babka	Blad, Ind.	Brooks, Pa.
Andrews, Md.	Bacharach	Blanton	Burdick

Burroughs	Hadley	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Rose
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardy, Colo.	MacCrate	Rouse
Campbell, Kans.	Haskell	MacGregor	Rowe
Casey	Hawley	Madden	Scott
Chindblom	Hays	Magee	Sells
Christopherson	Hernandez	Mapes	Shreve
Clark, Mo.	Hoch	Michener	Sinclair
Cole	Houghton	Miller	Sinnot
Copley	Howard	Minahan, N. J.	Smith, Idaho
Cramton	Huddleston	Monahan, Wis.	Smith, Mich.
Crowther	Hulings	Mondell	Stephens, Ohio
Currie, Mich.	Husted	Moore, Ohio	Strong, Kans.
Dallinger	Jacoway	Moore, Pa.	Summers, Wash.
Darrow	Jeffers	Morgan	Sweet
Davey	Johnson, Ky.	Murphy	Taylor, Colo.
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Tenn.
Dickinson, Iowa	Johnson, Wash.	Newton, Minn.	Thompson, Ohio
Dowell	Jones, Pa.	Nicholls, S. C.	Tillman
Dunbar	Juul	Nichols, Mich.	Timberlake
Dunn	Kendall	Nolan	Tincher
Dyer	Kennedy, Iowa	Ogden	Tinkham
Edmonds	Kinchelee	Osborne	Towner
Elliott	Kinkaid	Pange	Upshaw
Elston	Kitchin	Peters	Vaile
Emerson	Kleczka	Purnell	Vare
Evans, Nebr.	Knutson	Quin	Vestal
Evans, Nev.	Kreider	Radcliffe	Volstead
Fairfield	Lampert	Ragsdale	Walsh
Fess	Layton	Raker	Wason
Fordney	Lea, Calif.	Ramsey	Webster
Foster	Loneragan	Randall, Wis.	Wheeler
Freeman	Longworth	Reavis	White, Kans.
French	Luce	Reber	White, Me.
Fuller, Ill.	Lufkin	Reed, N. Y.	Williams
Garland	Luhning	Reed, W. Va.	Wood, Ind.
Glynn	McAndrews	Rhodes	Yates
Goodykoontz	McArthur	Ricketts	Young, N. Dak.
Gould	McClintic	Riddick	Zihlman
Graham, Ill.	McCulloch	Robison, Ky.	
Green, Iowa	McDuffie	Rogers	
Greene, Mass.	McKinley	Romjue	
Griest	McLaughlin, Mich.		

NAYS—89.

Aswell	Dupré	Maher	Smithwick
Bankhead	Flood	Major	Stedman
Barkley	Gallagher	Mansfield	Steele
Bee	Garlin	Martin	Stephens, Miss.
Bell	Gard	Mays	Stevenson
Black	Garner	Mead	Taylor, Ark.
Bland, Mo.	Garrett	Montague	Thompson, Okla.
Bland, Va.	Hardy, Tex.	Moore	Venable
Booher	Hastings	Mooney	Vinson
Box	Hayden	Moore, Va.	Watkins
Brand	Holland	Nelson, Mo.	Watson, Va.
Briggs	Hudspeth	O'Connell	Weaver
Buchanan	Hull, Tenn.	Oliver	Wellington
Byrnes, Tenn.	Igoe	Park	Welty
Candler	Johnston, N. Y.	Parrish	Wilson, La.
Caraway	Jones, Tex.	Rainey, J. W.	Wilson, Pa.
Carss	Lanham	Rayburn	Wingo
Carter	Lankford	Robinson, N. C.	Woods, Va.
Collier	Leshner	Rucker	Wright
Connally	McGleannon	Sabath	Young, Tex.
Crisp	McKeown	Sanders, La.	
Davis, Tenn.	McKiniry	Sisson	
Dominick	McLane	Small	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Dewalt

NOT VOTING—154.

Ayres	Esch	Kennedy, R. I.	Rodenberg
Barbour	Evans, Mont.	Kettner	Rowan
Benson	Ferris	Kiess	Rubey
Blackmon	Fields	Kling	Sanders, Ind.
Branson	Fisher	Kraus	Sanders, N. Y.
Britten	Fitzgerald	LaGuardia	Sanford
Browne	Focht	Langley	Saunders, Va.
Browning	Frear	Larsen	Schall
Brumbaugh	Fuller, Mass.	Lazaro	Scully
Burke	Gallivan	Lee, Ga.	Sears
Butler	Gandy	Leibach	Sherwood
Caldwell	Godwin, N. C.	Lever	Siegel
Campbell, Pa.	Goldfogle	Linthicum	Sims
Cannon	Good	Little	Slomp
Cantrill	Goodall	McFadden	Smith, Ill.
Carew	Goodwin, Ark.	McKenzie	Smith, N. Y.
Clark, Fla.	Graham, Pa.	McPherson	Snell
Classon	Greene, Vt.	Mann	Snyder
Cleary	Griffin	Mason	Stegall
Coady	Hamill	Merritt	Steenerson
Cooper	Hamilton	Moore, Ind.	Stiness
Costello	Harrison	Morin	Sullivan
Crago	Haugen	Mott	Sumners, Tex.
Cullen	Hedlin	Mudd	Temple
Curry, Calif.	Hersey	Neely	Thomas
Dale	Hersman	Newton, Mo.	Tilson
Dempsey	Hickey	Oldfield	Treadway
Denison	Hicks	Olney	Voigt
Dent	Hill	Overstreet	Walters
Dickinson, Mo.	Hull, Iowa	Padgett	Ward
Donovan	Humphreys	Parker	Watson, Pa.
Dooling	Hutchinson	Pell	Webb
Doremus	Ireland	Phelan	Whaley
Doughton	James	Platt	Wilson, Ill.
Drane	Johnson, Miss.	Porter	Winslow
Eagan	Kahn	Pou	Wise
Eagle	Kearns	Rainey, H. T.	Woodyard
Echols	Kelley, Mich.	Randall, Calif.	
Ellsworth	Kelly, Pa.	Riordan	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ESCH with Mr. WEBB.

Mr. FOCHT with Mr. AYRES.

Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. CLEARY.

Mr. KING with Mr. DRANE.

Mr. PLATT with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay," but I have a general pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. McFADDEN, and I now wish to change my vote to "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. DEWALT, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced, as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote whereby the House resolution was passed, and move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. I move that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to reconsider?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. What becomes of the gentleman's motion?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's motion is pending. Does the gentleman make it as a motion, or does he ask unanimous consent?

Mr. WINGO. He made it as a motion.

The SPEAKER. I thought he made it as a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BLANTON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves to lay the motion on the table.

Mr. WINGO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, where an objection is made, he can not make the double motion. Has he made a motion to reconsider?

The SPEAKER. He has made the motion to reconsider, and then the motion to lay that on the table.

Mr. WINGO. Can he make both at the same time where there is objection?

The SPEAKER. He did not make them at the same time. He made one subsequent to the other.

Mr. WINGO. I am not sure; I am asking for information.

The SPEAKER. The motion is not debatable. The motion is to lay the other motion on the table. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EMPLOYEES UNDER THE UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries be discharged from the further consideration of House resolution 77.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries be discharged from further consideration of House resolution 77, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 77.

Resolved, That the United States Shipping Board be, and it is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts—

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, enough has been read of the resolution to make it apparent that it is not a privileged resolution, and hence the motion to discharge the committee is not a privileged motion; and inasmuch as we have wasted nearly the whole day with this Democratic filibuster, with appropriation bills pending, I make a point of order against the motion, the point of order being that only resolutions addressed to the President and the heads of the executive departments have privilege.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. And I am quoting from the House Manual in section 836. If the Speaker desires anything more in connection with that, I will call his attention to—

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not desire any further suggestions on that line unless somebody desires to be heard against it.

Mr. BLANTON. I admit that the point is well taken.

Mr. ASWELL. The gentleman refers to "a Democratic filibuster." I would like to ask who is supporting the filibuster?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will answer that question by saying that it is entirely a Democratic performance.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to prefer a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks on the matters that came up to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks already made. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4226, being the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4226, the District of Columbia appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4226, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 4226, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose last evening there was an amendment pending, offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD], to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$10,000," in line 12, page 9. The question is on that amendment.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for motor vehicles, \$30,700. All of said motor vehicles and all other motor vehicles provided for in this act and all horse-drawn carriages and buggies owned by the District of Columbia shall be used only for purposes directly pertaining to the public services of said District, and shall be under the direction and control of the commissioners, who may from time to time alter or change the assignment for use thereof or direct the joint or interchangeable use of any of the same by officials and employees of the District: *Provided*, That no automobile shall be acquired hereunder, by purchase or exchange, at a cost, including the value of a vehicle exchanged, exceeding \$1,500 for one seating four or more persons and \$1,200 for one seating less than four persons.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee the reason for the increase in the limit of cost of these vehicles that can be purchased under this exchange procedure. Last year they were limited to \$900 and \$700. Now the limit has been increased to \$1,500 and \$1,200.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I believe the reason is that, although that limit was fixed in the old bill, they had to come to the deficiency committee to get an increase of this amount, and the increase is really now in the law under the deficiency bill.

Mr. WALSH. They could not get suitable vehicles under the smaller limitation?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Absolutely not.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think the gentleman will find there is a good reason for every one of these increases.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase and maintenance, hire of livery, of means of transportation for the coroner's office and the morgue, jurors' fees, witness fees, removal of deceased persons, making autopsies, ice, disinfectants, telephone service, and other necessary supplies for the morgue, and the necessary expenses of holding inquests, including stenographic services in taking testimony, and photographing unidentified bodies, \$5,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. A signal honor has been conferred to-day upon one of the Members of this House, and I feel that not only the Member himself but the membership of the House are honored, and that the Members should have the opportunity of expressing their approval. Gen. Petain, the great French general, has sent from the French front to Gen. Kuhn, of the Seventy-ninth Division, the decoration of the Croix de Guerre, to be conferred upon our colleague, ROYAL JOHNSON, of South Dakota. [Applause.] Gen. Kuhn has conferred that decoration upon our colleague to-day. I feel it is something that we ought to be proud of. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For enforcement of game and fish laws, to be expended under the direction of the commissioners, \$100.

Mr. GARD. I move to strike out the last word of this very inconsequential item for the purpose of asking about the game laws in the District of Columbia. What are the game laws in the District of Columbia? Do they apply to wild game or to the games that flourish in the haunts of peace? Does this apply to the police force, or is there a game and fish protective association or anything like that in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I really can not inform the gentleman of all the details as to how they expend this money. I do not think they expend the whole \$100. In case some Member of Congress should get on a rampage and go out and hunt wild geese or ducks or chickens, he might be subject to the provisions of the game laws of the District.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman mean that there is any laxity of enforcement of the game laws of the District of Columbia, which accounts for this small appropriation? I have made the inquiry in good faith, because I did not know there was any necessity, in this District of 10 miles square, for any very elaborate system of game laws; but after hearing the gentleman's suggestion about chickens I realize that I may be in error. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am informed that there is some wild game flying over, which occasionally alights out here on the Anacostia Flats, ducks and things of that kind.

Mr. GARD. Ducks?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; and if anybody shoots them and they fail to inform the authorities—the gentleman will notice that the amount here is pretty large—\$100. We have spent out of that some \$42.

Mr. GARD. The amount was so inconsequential that I wondered whether there were any game laws at all in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. If the gentleman will yield, I notice on the House Calendar there is a bill (H. R. 1199) to prohibit the purchase, sale, or possession for the purpose of sale of certain wild birds in the District of Columbia. That was introduced, I think, by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM]. I am sorry the gentleman is not a member of the deficiency committee, for if this bill goes into effect, as it will, we might have to have a deficiency of \$25 or \$50.

Mr. GARD. That is to take care of the wild birds.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; these wild birds alight on the flats of Anacostia. We are going to make a park at Anacostia some day, and we want to prevent the wild birds from encroaching on it.

Mr. GARD. One hundred dollars is sufficient, the gentleman thinks, to maintain the sanctity of the game laws of the District of Columbia, and no more?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; it was considered sufficient by the subcommittee, after extensive hearings, a few years ago. I think the fact is that a few years ago they had \$200, but it was cut down.

Mr. VARE. This sum has been in the bill year after year, has it not?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

For carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1899, entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," to pay members of the board of survey provided for therein, other than the inspector of buildings, at a compensation of not to exceed \$10 for each survey, and to pay the cost of making safe or removing such buildings upon the refusal or neglect of the owners so to do, the unexpended balance of the appropriation made for this purpose for the fiscal year 1913 is reappropriated for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee how much will be available under this paragraph and how it happens that the appropriation made for 1913 is still unexpended.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The record shows that the balance available July 1, 1918, will be \$1,753.81. That amount is now available, or nearly all of it.

Mr. WALSH. What was the original appropriation?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can not tell, but it was not a very large sum. That amount is available, and the commissioners think it is all that will be necessary during the coming year.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase of metal identification number tags for horse-drawn vehicles used for business purposes and motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, \$15,000.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] if this sum, \$15,000, is a misprint. The item, I notice, is increased from \$1,500 last year to \$15,000 this year.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think the gentleman is mistaken. I think we had \$10,000 in this item last year.

Mr. MAPES. I have the act before me, and it contains \$1,500. Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Then that is probably a misprint. I think the item was \$10,000 last year. There was quite a deficiency, which has been taken care of in the deficiency appropriation bill. The license has been changed recently here so that an increase is occasioned by that.

Mr. MAPES. The language is the same. What is this money used for?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Chiefly, and I think wholly, for the purchase of tags that are sold to the owners of automobiles. The number of automobiles is increasing very rapidly, and I think they changed the style of the tag so that they are a little more expensive, but it was deemed advisable.

Mr. MAPES. They have not increased ten times in the last year.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague will permit, I might suggest that under a former system an automobile license was permanent, whereas now it is annual. Each year every automobile must acquire a new license tag, whereas before only the new machines were compelled to buy them.

Mr. MAPES. Has that increased the expense from \$1,500 to \$15,000?

Mr. CRAMTON. It immensely increases the number of tags that must be furnished. Before it was a permanent license, and a man might use one license for five years if he did not get a new car. Now every automobile in the District must have a new license each year.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, in the current law the amount is \$10,000, and I am reading now from the official record.

Mr. MAPES. I have the act before me for the year ending June 30, 1918, and in that year it was \$1,500.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is the year before.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I would like some information in respect to the rights of a Congressman residing temporarily in the Capital. What is our privilege as an automobile owner? How many tags must we have?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The owner of an automobile registered in another State does not have to take out a license in the District. The tag of that State is recognized in the District of Columbia, except as to automobiles in the very friendly and interesting State of Maryland. There is a state of war as to automobile tags existing between the State of Maryland and the District of Columbia, and because the State of Maryland will not recognize in Maryland a District tag, the District does not recognize a Maryland tag. Otherwise the tag of any State is recognized as good in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FESS. So that an Ohio tag is recognized in the District?

Mr. CRAMTON. I may say that I drive an old car under a Michigan tag, and I drive it in the District under that tag.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inform the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] that recently—within the last year or two—they have required a double tag, one on the fore part of the machine and one on the rear. That is one occasion for the additional expense. That question was asked of Mr. Brownlow by Mr. Sisson, the former chairman of this committee, and Mr. Brownlow said that the extra tag was an extra burden of \$5,000, but that it was worth that for purposes of making identification more practical. That is why they increased it \$5,000 from the appropriation of \$10,000 before.

Mr. FESS. How long could an Ohio man temporarily residing here and having his automobile in the District use it on one tag?

Mr. CRAMTON. One year.

Mr. FESS. My concern is to know whether as a driver there is more than one tag necessary in order to be a law-abiding citizen.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I could not answer that question.

Mr. FESS. I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] has answered that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of answering further the question asked by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Even with regard to the State of Maryland, I will state to the gentleman that the State of Maryland readily recognizes the State number on any Member's car, no matter from what State he comes. For instance, I have upon my Texas car, upon which I pay a Texas license, and which has been here in the city of Washington for nearly three years, my Texas number on the front and on the rear. I can go all over the State of Maryland, and they readily recognize it. I can go in Virginia or New York or New Jersey or any other State, and there is a certain reciprocity existing between our home States and the District of Columbia and other States, such as passes the car of a Member; they readily recognize your State number, and it is absolutely unnecessary for any Member of Congress to pay the District license tax if he pays a license tax each year in his own State; and therefore I pay my license tax in my own State every year.

Mr. GARD. But it is not a matter of recognizing a man as a Member of Congress, is it?

Mr. BLANTON. No; it applies—

Mr. GARD. If I am a resident of Texas and I come along with my automobile with my Texas license, I am recognized in every State in the Union wherever I may go.

Mr. BLANTON. With this distinction, that Maryland will not recognize the license tax of any car from any State that does not in turn recognize the license tax of Maryland. It is a matter of reciprocity. That is the distinction, and the State of Texas recognizes a Maryland license tax.

Mr. VARE. In other words, Maryland is in favor of reciprocity.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; and every other State does that.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is a little more than that. The District desires to reciprocate with the State of Maryland, but Maryland will not reciprocate with the District, although Maryland does with every other State.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not talking about any petty strife that may exist between the District and Maryland, but I am talking about what exists between other States and Maryland.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I do.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The gentleman says the State of Maryland will recognize these licenses. Suppose a Member of Congress resides in Maryland during the sessions of Congress. Does the gentleman think he can continue to use the license from his State and not take a license from Maryland, if he remains there over 90 days, say?

Mr. BLANTON. I think a Member of Congress from the State of Maryland ought to pay the license tax in the State of Maryland, and that license tax ought to take him anywhere in the United States where there is a reciprocity existing between the States.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Usually the reciprocity is something of this kind, that the license from an outside State, we will say from Maryland, in—take the case of my State, say Illinois—is good for three months where one comes into the State to reside. Now, the question is where a Member of Congress comes here and resides in the District or in the State of Maryland and resides there three months, is it not compulsory on him to take out a license in the District or in the State of Maryland?

Mr. BLANTON. I think not, where he is taxed for a State license and keeps it up each year. I have had my same car here for nearly three years.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I have taken the chances on it myself.

Mr. FOSTER. I have had this experience recently. I went down and they told me that an Ohio license was good only for one year. Do I understand the gentleman from Texas has been using a license for three years—

Mr. BLANTON. No. I have paid my Texas license every year. I keep the same number and repay my license annually in Texas.

Mr. FOSTER. An Ohio license is good for one year, and they tax \$2.50 for a chauffeur's license for the city.

Mr. BLANTON. My annual license tax in Texas costs about \$15, something like that, if I remember correctly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Plumbing Inspection Division: To reimburse three assistant inspectors of plumbing for provision and maintenance by themselves of three motorcycles, for use in their official inspections in the District of Columbia, \$15 per month each, \$540.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman what is the necessity of retaining the language in lines 3, 4, and 5, on page 18? I

understand the elevator inspectors went out the other day on the point of order.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will inform the gentleman that they are doing the work just the same, whether that new language is in there or not. That language is for the purpose of requiring the parties to pay inspection fees to the inspector, but now since that was stricken out on the point of order it is paid just the same, but we pay it instead of the elevators that are inspected.

Mr. GARD. They are doing the work of inspection?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They have to do so. They are obliged to do so under the law.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Northwest: For paving with concrete Taylor Street, Rock Creek Church Road to New Hampshire Avenue, 30 feet wide, \$19,000.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of being afforded some information by the chairman of the committee. I am desirous of knowing the plan followed in the District of Columbia for the improvement and repair of streets. I will state in the very beginning of what I have to say that I favor the very best possible streets, as well as all other public utilities in the city of Washington, but what I am interested in is knowing the legal method of awarding contracts. Or do they do it themselves?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They award contracts for such work.

Mr. GARD. I notice these different appropriations all come out very nicely—say at \$10,000 and \$19,000. Is the appropriation made before the contract is awarded?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. These are the appropriations made, and we expect to build these streets within the limit of cost by contract.

Mr. GARD. Suppose they make a contract, for instance, for the paving of Taylor Street, for which an appropriation of \$19,000 is made, for \$18,254?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The balance would go into the Treasury.

Mr. GARD. Is it ever known that anything went back?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Very much of it goes back, I will inform the gentleman.

Mr. GARD. Take the individual appropriations or the appropriations for the several streets, and are they entirely used, or is there any residuary fund?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Sometimes there is, as I tried to explain to the gentleman here in my opening statement. Heretofore this has been appropriated in a lump sum, and your subcommittee or committee thought it was not advisable. We thought it should be consolidated, and there should be specified on the face of the bill the streets to be improved and the amount to be expended therefor. They may have some little difficulty occasionally with this, but I hardly think they will. But I will say to the gentleman that if they contract for \$49,000 and the work is performed for \$40,000 the balance would go back into the Treasury.

Mr. GARD. How many so-called contractors are there operating in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can not say; but I think the hearings will disclose that they have considerable competition, especially now. I was informed that a few years ago they did not have; that they had but very little competition; but now they say they have much of it.

Mr. GARD. Can the gentleman tell me whether there is any apportionment to contractors in the city of Washington by which one contractor gets part of the city and another contractor another part?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. There is nothing of the kind now. The lowest bidder gets the contract.

Mr. GARD. There is nothing of the kind now? Do you mean that there have been instances of that kind?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I used to think there had been years ago, but I do not wish the Record to say that I really knew anything of that kind. But I used to think probably there was. However, I am satisfied there is nothing of that kind now.

Mr. GARD. Are there more than two competing contractors for paving work in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They are not limited to contractors living in the District of Columbia, but they get them from the outside also.

Mr. GARD. But they do not get them from the outside.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They try to do so.

Mr. GARD. Do they get them?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can not inform the gentleman as to that. They have done it, I understand, recently.

Mr. GARD. Can the gentleman inform me if he has any information about any particular street paved within the last year?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I have not that information now, because we had no new streets paved in the last year at all, as the commissioners did not recommend any paving, and the old standard bill contained nothing of that kind.

Mr. GARD. That was on account of the necessity of conserving materials during the war?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes. The cost of materials was great, the shortage of labor was serious, and the expense was simply enormous.

Mr. GARD. When are these contracts for repairing these streets to be advertised?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. As speedily as possible after this law is passed and the money becomes available, as I am informed. The commissioners and the committee are anxious now that we should go on now making what we call permanent improvements, new work, and so forth, both on the streets and schools, which we had to leave out the year before.

Mr. GARD. It is very desirable to do that.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is what we have been attempting to do. We have not been extravagant. We have only gone as far as we could reach.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman a question: Whether or not he has given consideration to the fact that unless there is a clause added to the bill it might to some extent fail to carry out his purpose? In other words, if in any one of these particular contracts the estimates of the contractor or the lowest bidder would exceed the amount the commissioners could not award the contract?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do not think they could.

Mr. VARE. Now, then, if on another item they had a surplus of a thousand or more dollars, if given some latitude, they could award the contract where there had been a slight shortage without the commissioners coming back to Congress for additional authority. In other words, there ought to be a flexible clause added, so as not to handicap the commissioners.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I know. We do not desire to handicap them, but that might be called new legislation. We are anxious to avoid new legislation. We have a very active District Committee and they are seeking for new work, and we are very willing that they should go out and take up new work. I refer to the new chairman of the District Committee, Mr. MAPES.

Mr. VARE. There is only one period of the year when street paving can be properly done, when the climatic conditions are favorable, and if Congress would not be in session embarrassment might ensue in that regard.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will say to the gentleman that these new streets that we are proposing to improve here constitute what we call "new work." Their improvement is to be upon estimates just made, or made 10 days ago.

Mr. VARE. Are they estimates of the commissioners or are they estimates of street contractors backed up by bonds?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They are estimates which are new, not a year or a year and a half old. When we prepared these items we did not have an official copy of the estimates before us but a copy. The official estimates did not really get into our hands until we had prepared this bill, and when we had prepared it we found them to be correct, so recent are the estimates.

Mr. VARE. If it is the purpose of the commissioners to do this work promptly, without delay, their estimates would in no wise confine a contractor to the precise sums specified in the bill. He has to finance the operation and he would send his engineers on the work and he will make his own inspection and he will back up his estimate by a bond. Now, if in any one of these cases his opinion would be that the cost would exceed the estimate of the engineer of the District, there would absolutely be no way of having that street paved without the District Commissioners coming back to Congress for additional legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman may be right in that. I think possibly that is a good curb to have on them.

Mr. VARE. I might say, for the benefit of the committee, that I speak from experience. I have seen the same thing

worked out. The estimate of an engineer who has no financial responsibility is one thing, while the estimate of a contractor, who must necessarily carry out the specifications, who must finance his operation, is another thing.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VARE. I do.

Mr. MAPES. I notice a little further along here, on page 22, this language following the items:

In all, \$282,300, to be disbursed and accounted for as "Street improvements" and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

I wonder if the gentleman can tell why that clause is placed there in that way? Would that cover a situation such as the gentleman from Pennsylvania points out?

Mr. VARE. I do not believe it would.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It is to a certain extent a matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. MAPES. Would it cover the condition that the gentleman points out?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The fund will be upon the books of the department down here as a sort of improvement fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bottom of page 19, line 24, in order to make a typographical correction.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to return to line 24, page 19, for the purpose of making a correction. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. In line 24, on page 19, the spelling of the word "Delaware" should be corrected. I move that the correction be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk of the committee be authorized to correct any errors of spelling that may occur in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the clerk be authorized generally to correct the spelling throughout the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of calling attention to the remarks concerning unexpended balances and the lapsing of appropriations. There seems to have been an intimation that an unexpended balance might be available for further obligations within certain periods of time. Under an annual appropriation, as I understand it, the appropriation can be obligated under contracts or otherwise within the period of the year for which the appropriation is set apart and for no other time. Unless the contract is executed within the year for which the appropriation is made it can not be bound by any contract executed subsequent to that period. Any unexpended balance, however, in that appropriation will stand for a period of two years thereafter for the payment of any obligation legally incurred within the period of the year for which the appropriation was set apart. If, however, the total authorizations within that year do not equal the total amount of the appropriation, the unexpended balance of that appropriation will lapse into the general fund or into miscellaneous receipts at the end of the third year following. So that if any item unpaid at the end of that third year legally incurred within the first year should be presented for payment an account could be stated and sent to Congress for payment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Disposal of city refuse: To enable the commissioners to carry out the provisions of existing law governing the collection and disposal of garbage, dead animals, night soil, and miscellaneous refuse and ashes in the District of Columbia, including inspection and allowance to inspectors for maintenance of horses and vehicles or motor vehicles used in the performance of official duties, not to exceed \$25 per month for each inspector for horse-drawn vehicles, \$30 per month for automobiles, and \$15 per month for motorcycles; fencing of public and private property designated by the commissioners as public dumps; and incidental expenses, \$621,000: *Provided*, That any proceeds received from the disposal of city refuse or garbage shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the United States and the District of Columbia in equal parts: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be available for collecting ashes or miscellaneous refuse from hotels, places of business, large apartment or boarding houses.

Mr. VARE. I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I

should like to ask the chairman of the committee how the District Commissioners provide for the removal of ashes? Is it by contract or is it by the city employees?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. By contract. I think the gentleman is somewhat informed upon the situation of that ash contract. The matter has been satisfactorily adjusted and has gone into the deficiency bill, which is now in the Senate.

Mr. VARE. But the District is still having its ashes removed by contract?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The ashes are still removed by contract, yes; but the garbage is a little different proposition.

Mr. VARE. They are going to continue to have it done by contract?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The District bill gives the commissioners authority to remove the ashes themselves, or by contract—either way.

Mr. VARE. How much increase do they ask for the coming year over the past?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The last contract was for \$78,000. The estimate this year, under the general head of disposal of city refuse, for the ashes part of it, was \$100,000. They are getting it done now under a broken-down contract, so to speak, with very slight reimbursement, for a good deal less money than that, but it is impossible to do it next year for less than \$100,000. They really do not think they can do it for \$100,000. Maybe it will take \$125,000, but they ask for only \$100,000 now. I may state here that this total of \$621,000 is composed of the following items:

Garbage	\$455,130
Ashes	100,000
Miscellaneous refuse	35,400
Night soil	17,500
Dead animals	3,360
Inspection	9,110
Contingent expenses	500
	621,000

I will say to the gentleman that that matter has been canvassed up and down, by this committee and the deficiency committees of both the House and Senate, and I do not believe that a further examination of three months could cut that down one dollar.

Mr. VARE. I have no thought of asking the committee to cut down the amount. I simply wanted to get the information for the benefit of the committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The experience they have had is going to be very beneficial to the city of Washington.

Mr. VARE. I will ask the gentleman if it is not the fact that notwithstanding the commissioners had a bond filed for the removal of the ashes last year by the contractor, they found it was necessary to have \$20,000 in the last deficiency bill in order to partly reimburse him for his losses?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Only very slightly.

Mr. VARE. I say to partly reimburse him.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They thought it was cheaper to do it in this way.

Mr. VARE. The District had to come to his assistance by making additional appropriations, notwithstanding that the contractor had filed a bond.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. VARE. And there was a reliable surety company on the bond, which the District could have held, and have compelled to finish the job.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It would have doubled, even trebled what the cost was, to enforce the bond.

Mr. VARE. I fully agree with the gentleman. I had no desire to ask the question with the thought in mind that it was possible to reduce the item.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late and we have been struggling through a heated day; the attendance is not very great, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that we could not have read this bill for two or three hours to-day, because of the exigencies of the case, but I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4226, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE WAR EXPENDITURES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following gentlemen members of the Special Committee to Investigate War Ex-

penditures, under House resolution 78, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MCKENZIE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. REAVIS, Mr. MAGEE, Mr. McCULLOCH, Mr. BLAND of Indiana, Mr. JEFFERIS, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. DOREMUS, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. LEA of California.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas, indefinitely, on account of illness.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted—

To Mr. LEVER to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of J. W. Riser (H. R. 2470, 65th Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

To Mr. ASHBROOK to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Henry N. Tippet (H. R. 1096), no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 6, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the chairman of the United States Geographic Board, submitting an estimate of appropriation required by the board for necessary printing, being for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 77), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

CALENDAR OF MOTIONS TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEES—NOTICE.

Paragraph 4, Rule XXVII:

4. Any Member may present to the Clerk a motion in writing to discharge a committee from further consideration of any public bill or joint resolution which may have been referred to such committee 15 days prior thereto. All such motions shall be entered in the Journal and printed on a calendar to be known as a "Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees." Immediately after the Unanimous Consent Calendar shall have been called on any Monday it shall be in order to call up any such motion which shall have been entered at least 7 days prior thereto. Recognition for such motions shall be in the order in which they have been entered. When such motion shall be called up the bill shall be read by title only prior to a second being ordered by tellers, and no such motion shall be entertained as to a bill or joint resolution the title of which contains more than 100 words; after the reading of the bill by title the motion shall not be submitted to the House unless seconded by a majority by tellers; if such motion fails of a second, it shall be immediately stricken from the calendar and shall not be thereafter placed thereon. If a second be ordered, debate on such motion shall be limited to 20 minutes, one-half thereof in favor of the proposition and one-half in opposition thereto. Such motions shall have precedence over motions to suspend the rules and shall require for adoption an affirmative vote of a majority of the membership of the House. Whenever such a motion shall prevail the bill so taken from the consideration of a committee shall thereupon be placed upon its appropriate calendar, and upon call of the committee from which any bill has been so taken it may be called up for consideration by any Member prior to any bill reported by said committee at a date subsequent to the discharge of said committee: *Provided*, No Member shall have upon such calendar more than two motions at the same time.

No. 1.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, June 5, 1919.

Hon. WM. TYLER PAGE, *Clerk*.

SIR: In accordance with paragraph 4, Rule XXVII, I move to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 466) providing for an additional judge for the district of Arizona, the same having been referred to such committee 15 days prior to this date.

CARL HAYDEN,
Member of Congress.

No. 2.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, June 5, 1919.

Hon. WM. TYLER PAGE, *Clerk*.

SIR: In accordance with paragraph 4, Rule XXVII, I move to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1695) to amend section 4 of the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, as amended, the same having been referred to such committee 15 days prior to this date.

CARL HAYDEN,
Member of Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1706) authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Snake River about 3 miles above its confluence with the Columbia River near Pasco, Wash., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 21); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 4971) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Emporia, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4972) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wamego, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4973) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marion, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4974) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Westmoreland, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4975) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Peabody, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4976) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Harveyville, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4977) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Yates Center, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4978) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lyndon, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4979) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Burlingame, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4980) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Council Grove, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4981) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eureka, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4982) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Strong, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4983) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cottonwood Falls, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4984) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Burlington, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 4985) relieving honorably discharged officers and enlisted men from payment of premiums on policies of war-risk insurance for a period of two years from date of such discharge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 4986) to increase the limit of cost for the proposed new Federal building at Madison, Wis., and the site thereof; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 4987) to provide for the retirement of United States soldiers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 4988) to provide for the purchase of additional land for the enlargement of the site of the public building at Stamford, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4989) directing delivery of State war-service records to the States requesting same; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 4990) to establish a bureau for the study of criminal, pauper, and defective classes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4991) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Fort Jennings, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4992) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Fayette, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4993) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Napoleon, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4994) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Wauseon, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4995) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Paulding, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4996) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Van Wert, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4997) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bryan, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4998) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ottawa, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4999) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Defiance, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 5000) to allow credit for husbands' military service in case of homestead entries by widows, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 5001) granting annuities to all native or naturalized American citizens 65 years of age and over who have been residents of the country for 20 years and whose income is less than \$300 per year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5002) to provide pensions for all soldiers and marines of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and the Mexican War who now receive pensions at a minimum rate of \$50 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5003) to amend section 4414, Revised Statutes of the United States, to classify and provide salaries for clerks in the Steamboat-Inspection Service; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BABKA: A bill (H. R. 5004) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Cleveland, county of Cuyahoga, State of Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece with carriage captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 5005) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lanesboro, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 5006) to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Park, Calif., and to change the name of said park to Roosevelt National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 5007) granting citizenship to certain Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5008) to provide for election of Osage tribal officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5009) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5010) to regulate the payment of moneys to Osage Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 5011) to establish a patent and trade-mark office independent of any other department, and to provide for compensation and infringement of patents in the form of general damages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5012) to establish a United States court of patent appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 5013) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Totowa, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5014) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Prospect Park, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5015) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Haledon, county of Passaic, N. J., one

German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5016) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of West Paterson, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5017) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 5018) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Stafford Springs, Conn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5019) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Plainfield, Conn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5020) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Stafford Springs, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5021) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rockville, Conn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5022) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Middletown, Conn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5023) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Willimantic, Conn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCGLENNON: A bill (H. R. 5024) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station, Morristown, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 5025) to extend existing pension benefits to Confederate soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to the widows of Confederate soldiers, sailors, and marines during the remainder of their lives; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 5026) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Watseka, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 5027) to provide homes for soldiers, seamen, and marines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 5028) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the town of Morton, Pa., captured cannon or fieldpiece and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD (by request): A bill (H. R. 5029) to provide for the manufacture and sale of alcohol for other than beverage purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5030) making appropriation for the construction and completion of certain public works on the Ohio, Mississippi, and Missouri Rivers; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 5031) to provide for the erection of a public building at Everett, Bedford County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 5032) to extend the franchise in the parishes and separate congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GOODALL: A bill (H. R. 5033) to provide for an examination and survey of the Saco River, Me., at or near its mouth; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 5034) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the importation of nursery stock and other plants and plant products; to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts for plant diseases and insect pests; to permit and regulate the movement of fruits, plants, and vegetables therefrom, and for other purposes," known as the plant quarantine act, approved August 20, 1912; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 5035) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hillsboro, county of Jefferson, in the State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5036) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fredericktown, Madison County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5037) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ste. Genevieve, Ste. Genevieve County, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5038) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Van Buren, Carter County, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5039) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Greenville, Wayne County, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5040) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Centerville, Reynolds County, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5041) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ironton, Iron County, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5042) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Farmington, St. Francois County, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5043) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Perryville, Perry County, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: Resolution (H. Res. 96) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the House of Representatives with certain information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALSH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 90) directing the United States Coast Guard to resume its operations under the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 100) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Lancaster, Wis., tents, cots, and blankets for the use of the World War soldiers in their home-coming celebration July 3 and 4, 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 101) to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the continuation of the war in which the United States is now engaged and until midnight of December 31 of the year following that in which such war is concluded; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Memorial from the Legislature of Ohio, requesting the Secretary of War to make provision that all trophies of war captured by Ohio troops be collected and sent to Ohio to be kept as perpetual memorials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, requesting the Secretary of War to make provisions that all trophies of war captured by Ohio troops be collected and sent to Ohio to be kept as perpetual memorials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to advocate independence and protectorate for Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOONEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, requesting the Secretary of War to make provision that all trophies of war captured by Ohio troops be collected and sent to Ohio to be kept as perpetual memorials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 5044) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to examine and adjust the account of William R. Little, or his heirs, with the Sac and Fox Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5045) for the relief of the trustees of the Christian Church at Missouri City, Clay County, Mo.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5046) for the relief of the heirs of John G. W. Brooks; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5047) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas Estes; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5048) for the relief of Rueben McKroskie; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5049) for the relief of James W. Murray, jr.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 5050) granting a pension to Ella A. Pollard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5051) granting a pension to William Sommers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5052) granting a pension to William H. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5053) granting a pension to Nettie B. Shores; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5054) granting a pension to John W. Warman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5055) granting a pension to Sarah C. Mattox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5056) granting an increase of pension to Charles Douthitt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5057) granting an increase of pension to William D. Daniels; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5058) granting an increase of pension to Schyler C. Pool; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5059) granting an increase of pension to Jobe C. Walton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5060) granting an increase of pension to Joe Loudermilk, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5061) granting an increase of pension to John J. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5062) granting a pension to Sarah E. Dillon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5063) granting a pension to Thomas B. Perkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5064) granting a pension to James M. Vint; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5065) granting a pension to James M. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5066) granting a pension to James E. Yeager; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5067) granting a pension to James Cullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5068) granting a pension to Nancy Grider; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5069) granting a pension to Minor Howard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5070) granting a pension to George Eskew; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5071) granting a pension to Casey A. Cox; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5072) granting a pension to Virgil O. Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5073) granting a pension to Joseph Bessi; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5074) granting a pension to Frank R. Wall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5075) granting a pension to Gilbert E. Donnelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5076) granting a pension to Augustus H. Beecher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 5077) granting an increase of pension to Alexander B. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5078) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Kizzie Gill, widow of Jeremiah Gill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5079) granting an increase of pension to Henry Parrish; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 5080) to correct the military record of John H. Addleman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 5081) for the relief of J. E. Adams; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5082) for the relief of William O. Linsley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 5083) for the relief of Edward W. Whitaker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 5084) granting a pension to W. W. Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 5085) granting a pension to Margaret Dexter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5086) granting a pension to Ann Bullard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5087) granting a pension to Thomas L. Feyen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5088) granting an increase of pension to James L. Doris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5089) for the relief of John Dauberman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5090) granting a pension to Amel G. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5091) granting a pension to Frank A. Morton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5092) for the reimbursement of Parnell M. Cameron; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5093) granting an increase of pension to Cicero R. Rhinearson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 5094) to fix the status, for certain purposes, of Elizabeth Dickinson as a member of the Army Nurse Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5095) for the relief of Jacob Meyers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 5096) granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Slanker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5097) granting an increase of pension to Jesse W. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5098) granting an increase of pension to George Brenizer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5099) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Dittenhafer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5100) granting an increase of pension to James H. Lockwood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5101) granting an increase of pension to Raymond E. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5102) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Boffenmyre; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5103) granting an increase of pension to Simon Corl; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5104) granting a pension to Estella R. Wetzel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5105) granting a pension to John George; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5106) granting a pension to Willard Kolp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5107) granting a pension to Harry L. Kepler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5108) granting a pension to Rose Phillips Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5109) to complete the military record of Theodore Silas Steffy and for an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5110) to correct the military record and grant an honorable discharge to Joseph W. Bevard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5111) to correct the military record and grant an honorable discharge to Charles M. Bingham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5112) to correct the military record and grant an honorable discharge to Adam B. Ackerman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5113) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John S. Ellis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5114) for the relief of John W. Seaver; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5115) for the relief of David B. Turnipseed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 5116) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Meredith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5117) granting an increase of pension to Lawson F. Myers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5118) granting a pension to Callie B. Boatright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5119) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Talley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 5120) granting a pension to Eliza K. Leman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5121) granting a pension to Peter F. Wesner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 5122) granting an increase of pension to William L. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Joseph E. Silverstein at memorial mass meeting in Rochester, N. Y., relative to persecution of Jews in Poland, and urging our Government to prevent further shedding of Jewish blood; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of F. D. Beyer & Co., planing-mill work, chairman temperance committee, Tyrone, Pa., against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of the Jugo-Slav Gymnastic Society Sokal, protesting against Italian imperialism force in Jugo-Slav territory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of mass meeting of St. Louis citizens at Moolah Temple, protesting against the persecutions of Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Peter Ballenbacher, representing Brewery Workers' Union, No. 22, Pittsburgh, Pa., urging repeal of prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABKA: Petition of Slovenic Progressive Benefit Society, relative to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BACHARACH: Petition of mass meeting of citizens of Atlantic City, N. J., protesting against the atrocities inflicted upon the Jews in Poland, Roumania, and Galacia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Petition of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local No. 558, Sheffield, Ala., relative to nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of a mass meeting held at Providence, R. I., relative to the persecution of Jews in European countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLE: Petition of First Methodist Episcopal Church and Sunday school, Bucyrus, Ohio, protesting against the repeal of war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron-Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, Marion, Ohio, Local No. 336, favoring Government control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of men's bible class of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, Bucyrus, Ohio, protesting against any repeal of war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Crestline (Ohio) Lodge, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks of America, to provide for Government control of railroads for a period of five years after peace has been declared; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Ohio Retail Clothiers and Furnishers Association, Cincinnati, Ohio, urging the repeal of the so-called luxury-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition of 10 citizens of Butler, Mo., urging retention of war-time prohibition and passage of laws to enforce same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of Sycamore, Ill., favoring repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Carnation Milk Products Co., opposing an absolute long and short haul clause to section 4 of the act to regulate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of National Garment Retailers' Association, favoring repeal of section 904 of the revenue act, levying a tax on retail sales; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Public Utilities Commission of Illinois for the immediate return of the telegraph and telephone systems to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Wasco (Ill.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, opposing repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Jugo-Slav organization of Oglesby, Ill., concerning the Jugo-Slav-Italian situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition and memorial of the members and friends of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, of Moline, Ill., protesting against lifting the ban on the manufacture and sale of wine and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition and memorial of sundry citizens of Hancock County, Ill., protesting against the modification of the war-time prohibition act to permit the sale and manufacture of beer and wine, as recommended by the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition and memorial of sundry citizens of Augusta, Ill., protesting against the modification of the war-time prohibition act to permit the manufacture and sale of beer and wine, as recommended by the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition and memorial of sundry citizens of Rozetta Township, Henderson County, Ill., protesting against the modification of the war-time prohibition act to permit the manufacture and sale of beer and wine, as recommended by the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Augusta, Ill., urging a repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Milan, Ill., for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of residents of Smyrna, Walton, Stamford, South Otselic, Delancey, and the vicinity of Norwich, all in the State of New York, for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of American War Garden Committee and the Anasco Co., of Binghamton, N. Y., against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Petition of Slov-Sloga, stv. 342, relating to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERSEY: Petitions of Rev. A. E. Morris and 93 residents of Bangor, and G. H. Gove and 49 others, E. C. McLaughlin and 48 others, and E. B. Tetley and 20 others, all of Mapleton, Me., urging continuance of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of Workers' Defense Union, New York City, demanding immediate repeal of the espionage act; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Shaw-Walker Co. and 500 employees, opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of National Pickle Packers' Association, of Chicago, Ill., and of the Crockery Board of Trade, of New York, N. Y., urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Metal and Thermit Corporation, of New York, opposing the continuance of the Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of residents of San Francisco, Calif., urging repeal of certain sections of revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of California Federation of Women's Clubs, indorsing the movement for the establishment of a department of education with a Cabinet officer; to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolution of California Federation of Women's Clubs, indorsing rank for nurses in the Army, Navy, and Red Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the American Federation of Arts, urging competent planning of landscape, architectural, and sculptural work in American cemeteries in France; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Providence (R. I.) Housewives' League, urging reduction in food prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions adopted by Grand Court of Foresters of America for the State of Rhode Island, urging peace conference to apply doctrine of self-determination to Ireland, and also resolution protesting against favorable attitude of American peace delegates to claims of Jugo-Slavs and the entrance of the United States into any entangling European alliances; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Pawtucket (R. I.) Business Men's Association, protesting against proposed repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KETTNER: Resolutions adopted at the eighteenth annual convention of the California Federation of Women's Clubs of California, Mrs. Herbert A. Cable, president, favoring a league of nations, indorsing a national department of education, favoring legislation giving proper recognition and rank to nurses, favoring a change in the citizenship laws affecting women, favoring legislation which will free child labor, and asking for enactment of legislation to withdraw protection of our Government of the United States from any American citizen who engages in traffic of alcoholic liquors in a foreign country; and also resolution of Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Los Angeles Lodge, No. 602, favoring placing of railroads under Government control for five years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, protests of L. D. Webber, of San Diego, the La Habra Methodist Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Calexico, the Riverside County Christian Endeavor Union, Riverside, and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Normal Heights, San Diego, all in the State of California, against the lifting of ban on beer and wine, and also resolution by the San Francisco Labor Council, of San Francisco, Calif., indorsing the recommendation of President Wilson on the subject of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, appeal of Showley Bros. Confectionery, San Diego, Calif., for the repeal of 5 per cent excise candy tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of California Cattlemen's Association, San Francisco, Calif., urging return of railroads to owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco, Calif., urging early passage of the bill furnishing home-steads to returned soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution adopted at the sixteenth annual encampment, Spanish War Veterans of California, in favor of pensions for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of First Baptist Church, Riverside; Methodist Episcopal Church of Normal Heights, San Diego; Missionary Federation of San Bernardino, all in the State of California, against lifting of ban on beer and wine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of California Cattlemen's Association, of San Francisco, Calif., urging early control and regulation of the unappropriated public domain for grazing purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of sundry patrons of soda fountain and ice cream parlors, protesting against the tax on sodas and creams; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Lumber Exchange of Baltimore, Md., and 15,000 employees, protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of David F. Cramer for the initiative and referendum amendment to the Constitution of the United States; also, the noninterest bond bill, as advocated by Jacob Sechler Coxey, sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Edward S. Apple, of Baltimore, Md., against repeal of daylight-saving law; Louis N. Adler, of Baltimore, Md., against repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. D. Virdin, protesting against the Poin-dexter bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Cohen, Coblen Co. and Hutzler Bros. Co., of Baltimore, Md., for repealing section 904 of the revenue law of 1918; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of A. Roth Shoe Manufacturing Co., Ladies' McKay Novelties, protesting against the persecution of Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Washington Camp, No. 3, Patriotic Order of Sons of America, of Maryland, favoring the Tower-Smith bill for betterment of public schools of United States; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Maryland State Grange, relating to Mondell bill (H. R. 487); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of employees of the Whitaker Paper Co., of Baltimore City, protesting against the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of F. P. Paternal and United States Railroad Administration, and W. W. Widerman and 600 persons, making 755 signers, all of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Ellicott Machine Corporation, of Baltimore, Md., protesting against a further appropriation for the continuance of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Manufacturers and Traders' National Bank, J. T. Snyder (president William Hengere Co.), C. A. Weed & Co., Louis L. Berger, Seegrist & Fray, J. L. Hudson Co., W. H. Sanford Car & Foundry Co., all of Buffalo; and Frank Faust, manager Depew plant American Car & Foundry Co., Depew, N. Y., opposing the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Stewart Motor Corporation, Buffalo, N. Y., opposing Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Retail Merchants' Association, Johnson Kurtz Co., and Chevrolet Tarrytown Leahy, asking for repeal of luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Alden-Marilla Sunday School Association, urging bill to define intoxicating liquors, all liquors containing more than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of McBriar Class, of Plymouth Methodist Church, 126 men, protesting against any change in the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of special clerks, members of Branch No. 31, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, of Syracuse, N. Y., protesting against the interpretation of provisions in the Post Office bill so as not to provide

increases to designated special clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Shelton, and the quarterly conference of Westport Methodist Episcopal Church, of Westport, all in the State of Connecticut, opposing the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of United National Association of Post Office Clerks, Branch No. 10, Cleveland, Ohio, relative to salaries of post-office clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Slovenic Progressive Benefit Society, Cleveland, Ohio; Sol Naprey Lodge, No. 5, S. N. P. J.; Subenjska Jolind; Slovenian Mutual Benefit Association; Jugo-Slav Republican Alliance, No. 9, relative to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of W. S. Wing, eastern sales manager of the Universal Portland Cement Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of L. C. Letzkus, of the Universal Portland Cement Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of George E. Foss, general secretary Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, of Harrisburg, Pa., protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURPHY: Affidavits supporting House bill 4718, pension for Winfield S. Handley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Crockery Board of Trade of New York, urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, and Soft Drink Workers of America, for exempting 2½ per cent beer from prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: Petition of Ed Anderson, of Kinderhook, and 44 other citizens of Pike County, and Edwin Batty and 19 other citizens, all of the State of Illinois, against repeal of prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSE: Petition of First Methodist Episcopal Church of Tyrone, Pa., protesting against any modification of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWAN: Letter from Frank E. Laughrum, of New York City, regarding educational affairs; to the Committee on Education.

Also, letter from Alfred D. Hadel, Lilian L. Hadel, Theo. Hadel, and Helena Hadel, of New York City, favoring daylight saving; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of F. B. Overman, Remington Typewriter Co., Rogers-Pyatt Shellac Co., National Automatic Sprinkler Association, Almerall & Co. (Inc.), New Amsterdam Casualty Co., American Cyanamid Co., and letter from Elliott H. Goodwin to chairman of Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and Shaw-Walker Co., executive council of American War Garden Committee, all of New York, favoring daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Paris, Allen & Co., importers, New York City, against prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of T. A. Veckers, secretary National Pickle Packers' Association, of Chicago, Ill., and William F. Dolflinger, of New York City, earnestly urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of Newport Lodge of Elks, Newport, Ky., opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of J. E. Sinclair and 58 other residents of Caledonia, Le Roy, and Pavilion, and vicinity, all in the State of New York, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 81 residents of Oakfield, N. Y., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 94 residents of Warsaw, N. Y., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petitions of residents of Troy, Cohoes, and Watervliet, all in the State of New York, protesting against the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment until the United States Supreme Court decides the legality of same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of residents of Berne, N. Y., favoring the enforcement of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of residents of Cohoes, Troy, Watervliet, and Waterford, all in the State of New York, protesting against the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment until the United States Supreme Court decides on the legality of same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition by citizens of the seventeenth congressional district of Illinois in behalf of the rights of the Jugo-Slavs under the peace treaty with Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of the Pawtucket (R. I.) Business Men's Association, protesting the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of 1,008 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against tax on sodas and ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 359, Carpenters and Joiners of America, asking provision for working conditions service United States Employment Bureau; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of United Housesmiths and Bridgemen's Union of Philadelphia, asking provision for working conditions service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of citizens of Philadelphia, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of Sunapee Lake Grange, No. 112, South Newbury, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Dorchester Grange, No. 280, of Dorchester, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Bear Hill Grange, No. 39, of Henniker, N. H., asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: Petition of Insley A. Bean and 46 residents of Lewiston, Me., urging the continued enforcement of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINGO: Petition of Slov-Delavsko organization of Jenny Lind, Ark., relating to the controversy between Italy and Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of John Mohas, president, and others of Hartford, Ark., regarding controversy between Italy and Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Frank Dominick, president, and others of Hartford, Ark., regarding controversy between Italy and Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of John Zimmerman and others of Hartford, Ark., regarding controversy between Italy and Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, June 6, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, every thought of Thy name is an ennobling thought. Meditation upon Thy name is the inspiration and uplift of the spirit of man. We begin our day's toil thinking upon Thee and seeking Thy guidance and Thy blessing, that we may pitch our life and our service upon a plane that is well pleasing in Thy sight and at the close of the day have the comfortable satisfaction that we have honored Thy name and advanced the interests of Thy people. We pray Thy guidance this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of Post Office Clerks' Union No. 125, National Federation of Postal Employees, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the reclassification of salaries of postal clerks, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. MOSES presented petitions of Local Union No. 558, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Sheffield, Ala., setting forth their grievances with the War Department regarding conditions, etc., at Muscle Shoals, Ala., which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of Local Lodge No. 839, Order of B'nai B'rith, of Manchester, N. H., remonstrating against the massacre of Jews in Poland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.